This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 08175507 0

Digitized by Google

MICROFILMED

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXIV.

JULY—DECEMBER.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1852.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.
Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

OF

No. LXXVII.

PAGE

ART. I.—'Cyclops Christianus;' or, an Argument to disprove the supposed Antiquity of the Stonehenge and other Megalithic Erections in England and Britanny. By Algernon Herbert 1

II.—The History of Mary Queen of Scots. By F. A. Mignet 20

III.—1. The Law of Pews in Churches, &c. By G. H. H. Oliphant, Esq. Barrister-at-law.

2. Church Pews, their Origin and Legal Incidents, with some Observations on the Propriety of abolishing them. By John Coke Fowler, Esq. Barrister-at-law.

3. The Pew System the chief Hindrance of the Church's Work in Towns. A Sermon by the Rev. Edward Stuart, M.A. 81

IV.—The Record Newspaper.—Report of the Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, May 5 137

V.—1. Miss Sellon and the 'Sisters of Mercy.' An Exposure of the Constitution, Rules, Religious Views, and Practical Working of their Society; obtained through a Sister who has recently seceded. By the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M. Vicar of Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire.

Digitized by Google

PAGE

2. Reply to a Tract by the Rev. J. Spurrell, containing certain Charges concerning the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth. By the Superior of the Society.

3. A Letter to Miss Sellon, Superior of the Society of Sisters of Mercy, at Plymouth. By Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter.

4. A Rejoinder to the Reply of the Superior of the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth, to a Pamphlet entitled, 'Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy:' by the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M. By the same. &c. &c. &c. 151

VI.—Les Provinciales; et leur Réfutation. Par M. l'Abbé Maynard, Chanoine Honoraire de Poitiers. Ouvrage dédié à Mons. de Vesins, Evêque d'Agen 176

NOTICES OF BOOKS 244

TITLE-PAGE AND INDEX TO VOL. XXIII.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

OF

No. LXXVIII.

PAGE

ART. I.—1. A Voyage to Iceland. By Madame Ida Pfeiffer.

2. A Woman's Journey Round the World 255

II.—1. The Poetical Works of David Macbeth Moir (Δ). Edited by Thomas Aird; with a Memoir of the Author.

2. The Poetical Works of John Edmund Reade ... 283

III.—1. The Law relating to Convocations of the Clergy, with Forms of Proceeding in the Provinces of Canterbury and York. By Robert R. Pearce, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

2. Morning Chronicle, from July 28 to August 25, 1852.

3. The Guardian, of the same period.

4. John Bull, of the same period 342

IV.—The Monthly Packet of Evening Readings, 1852; A Garland for the Year 385

Digitized by Google

PAGE

ART. V.—Report of the Trial and Preliminary Proceedings in the case of the Queen on the Prosecution of G. Achilli v. Dr. Newman. With an Introduction, containing Comments on the Law and on the course of the Trial; also with the Pleadings and Affidavits; and copious Notes, particularly on the Constitution and Practice of the Court of Inquisition. By W. F. Finlason, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Author of 'Leading Cases in Pleading,' 'Charitable Trusts,' &c. Third Edition 401

VI.—The Study of Words. By the Rev. R. Chenevix Trench, B.D. 425

VII.—Japan: an Account, Geographical and Historical, &c. By Charles Mac Farlane..... 447

NOTICES OF BOOKS 473

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1852.

ART. I.—*'Cyclops Christianus;' or, an Argument to disprove the supposed Antiquity of the Stonehenge and other Megalithic Erections in England and Britanny.* By ALGERNON HERBERT. Petheram, High Holborn. 1849.

THE march of inquiry is producing wonderful havoc. We are every year dispossessed of some childhood's fancy or manhood's prejudice. We once as little doubted the right of our first William to the title of 'Conqueror' as, in our unreasoning infancy, we questioned the historical existence of the wives of Bluebeard, or the cat of Whittington. But we are growing wiser. We are now told to attach no higher meaning to William's *soubriquet*, as the first of his line, than the lawyer who gave it intended we should, and to repudiate its connexion with notions of heroism and conquest. It is many years since German professors destroyed our confidence in Romulus and Remus, but we still regarded with fond security the names and deeds of the Druids as ground which the rude hands of criticism dared not invade, little dreaming that our children would be taught to doubt that Stonehenge—Sacred Stonehenge! was the work of that time-honoured priesthood! Yet that that hour of scepticism is at hand, the 'gloss' upon the quaint title of the above treatise will go far to convince us.

The book thus unpretendingly introduced to us exhibits much varied learning and research, and reopens a question of such general interest, that we make no apology for bringing it before our readers. It is, in fact, a partial reproduction, in a more popular form, of a subject discussed at greater length in two works called 'Britannia after the Romans,' and an 'Essay on the Neo-Druidic Heresy,' published by the author some years ago, but which from their size and arrangement scarcely presented sufficient attraction to the general reader. Mr. Herbert is perhaps also remembered by the *virtuosi* as the juvenile author

of some 'Discussions on several passages of History and Mythology,' an original and not uninteresting attempt to mould into form and order some of the doubts and fancies which the Wolf and Bryant school of criticism brought into fashion. Whatever may be thought of the value of the theories propounded in those works, there can be little question of their being the production of an able and capacious mind animated with all the ardour necessary for the deepest research. So far our author presents sufficient credentials for this his latest task. But the hand which clears the rubbish from the surface of the mine, and opens the first glimpse of the bright veins beneath, performs too often a thankless labour. To remove such a reproach is our present object. It is simply our desire to draw attention to and acknowledge the obligation which works like that before us confer on our literature, hoping that the time may not be far distant when the inquiries here instituted may awaken a corresponding spirit of research, and elicit, what they at least deserve, a deliberate disproval. The doctrine of the 'Cyclops' unrefuted tends to dissipate at once the theories of the scholar and the traditions of the unlearned; and lest any one rashly condemn it as fanciful or imaginative, let him remember how simply mythical are all the present notions which, in the absence of sure tradition, we entertain on the subject—mythical too, without rhyme or reason in their falsehood. Mr. Herbert has wrought a great work, if it is only to rescue from obscurity the antimyth of Stonehenge—the true poetical, if not the real historical, version of its origin.

We will abstain here from criticising the real value of the quotations made from the obsolete learning of our author, but will, for the present purpose, take them upon trust, *'perito cuique in arte sud credendum est;'* for we think we shall better deserve the thanks of those who have not time to go through this laborious work, if we endeavour to present them with a slight sketch of some of Mr. Herbert's arguments and general results.

The first part of his task is devoted to the refutation of established traditional prejudice, which, lichen-like, has obscured the original characters imprinted on all monuments of old, rendering them illegible to any but a zealous and discriminating inquirer.

Mr. Herbert contends that it is erroneous to infer, in the absence of any more certain information, that the date of megalithic works *must* be carried back to a remote age, and their origin ascribed to a 'nation of whom tradition has scarcely preserved the name.' 'Antiquity,' Mr. Herbert argues, is essentially a relative term, most grievously abused in common parlance. It is, in fact, to the modern archæologist what the Hyperboreans

Digitized by Google

or the Pygmies were to the old geographers. As there was nothing too marvellous to be predicated of those nations, so there is no difficulty or absurdity, no inconsistency whatever, which has not been evaded under the convenient shelter of a mysterious antiquity.

Another error consists in supposing that the mere shapelessness and rudeness of megalithic works entitle them to the designation of *ancient*. 'The inference of antiquity,' says our author, 'from rudeness and simplicity of style, is but vague 'and declamatory. Fine works adorned Nineveh and the oldest 'empires on record, and rude ones satisfy many nations at this 'day, and will hereafter. Though rudeness or polish may 'sometimes distinguish the infancy or maturity of a given state, 'they may also distinguish its maturity from its last decline; 'but they can never indicate mere time. Phidias was not a 'modern, though he lived at a late epoch of the city of Cecrops.' (P. 80.) And he adds: 'But this topic fails entirely when the 'works, rude and fierce in their taste, imply much resource of 'art and wealth; for taste or fanaticism may affect stern forms, 'either inventing them, reviving them, or importing them from 'abroad. Therefore the argument (from style) destroys itself, 'or assumes this arbitrary shape: that the primitive ages, and 'they alone, combined skill with an austere style. Surely this '(*sc.* that of Stonehenge) is one of the cases in which (as Lord 'Aberdeen says of the Attic coinage) the affectation of an 'archaic style of work is easily distinguished from the rudeness 'of remote antiquity.'

But the arch-error, in our author's view, with regard particularly to the works under our consideration, is the attributing them, directly or indirectly, to the Druids; or, to express ourselves more correctly, the placing their origin in a period anterior to the Roman advent. We were, we confess, so great was the force of habit, somewhat startled by our author's formal scepticism on this head. For though the hypothesis which he rejects has been often questioned and apparently matched with opposite hypotheses, yet its acceptance always seemed to us, on the whole, to be a case somewhat like that which a great modern statesman has called 'le triomphe du pis aller.' Indeed, its 'tenure by sufferance' was so far established, that Sir Richard Hoare, with some qualification, admits its claim; for, after reviewing the results of his several predecessors' inquiries, he expresses his conclusion that though the Druids may have been the ministers, yet they were not the *masons* of these temples, which were probably the rude work of the primitive Celts or Belgic tribes, who first colonised our island. Now, we confess, with all submission, that this distinction, though apparently adverse to, is in

Digitized by Google

fact not inconsistent with, the prevalent notion. For, it is scarcely probable that a proud priesthood like the Druids, who were at once the rulers and teachers of the nation, would identify themselves with any system of worship,—Celtic, Belgic, or Teutonic,—to the establishment of which they were not parties; but if they did identify themselves with any such system, the temples designed and completed in their times, and for the purpose of such worship, might, in general parlance, be said to have been *built* by them, though they exercised no more superintendence over the mere masonry, than did Cheops over the Pyramid, or William of Wykeham over his chapels and cloisters at Winchester and Oxford.

The 'Quarterly Review,' No. XII., in its notice of Sir Richard Hoare's work, gives countenance to the Druidical hypothesis; and we believe it has till now remained substantially unassailed. But Mr. Herbert, disputing its claim simply on its merits, suggests two propositions for our consideration: one, that these temples are not Druidic, nor ante-Roman; the other, that they really and in fact bear the impress of a much more modern date. On the former of these it will be enough, we think, to read his objections, to feel that they are entitled to great consideration.

As to his first proposition, he argues *à priori*, that assuming all we have heard about the Druids to be true, we are guilty of inconsistency in assigning to their times and agency the construction of such temples as Abury and Stonehenge, because we thereby attribute to the same people, at the same period, and under the same circumstances, a two-fold system of worship.[1] If, as we have been taught, their favourite and most efficacious sacrifice was the burning of a wicker giant, with its enclosed hecatomb of human beings,—their most sacred shrine, the mystic oaken grove in the depth of the forest,—how can we account for the simultaneous use of so different a ritual as these temples would imply, celebrated in rude circles of stones on the open champaign, and of which the chief feature was the altar offering? Reasonable doubts have been entertained by most antiquaries whether *altars*, in the sense in which we understand the word, are described in the accounts of the religious ceremonies of the Druids, (see Mr. Herbert's 2d Section and note 3,) whereas all agree in discovering the *ara* amongst the remains of these temples which we are considering, with its 'ring-stone,' to which the victim was tied previous to the sacrifice.

[1] Dr. Henry has indeed endeavoured to combine the two systems. He speaks of groves, 'in the centre of which were rows of large stones set perpendicular in the earth.' But Stonehenge stood in the midst of a *barren* plain; while the nature of the works at Abury would seem to preclude trees as part of the original design.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Herbert's second objection on this head is still more striking. He contends, apparently with no less force than justice, that supposing the colossal system of works, which we generally call Druidic, to have existed in Britain in the times of those classical authors from whom we derive all our knowledge of our country and its inhabitants in those ages, it is hardly credible that they should not have noticed them.[1] Yet all are silent. The fact is unimpeachable. Of one thing we may be certain, that whatever was the cause of their silence, it is not to be attributed to their underrating such striking objects. We should as soon expect that Herodotus could have walked through Egypt, and omitted all notice of the Pyramids. It would be, indeed, past belief that men like Cæsar, Tacitus, and Pliny—the Napier, the Macaulay, and the Heeren of the age, to say nothing of a host of others, poets as well as prose writers, by whom Britain was rendered famous—should, even if they themselves had not felt very deeply impressed by such monuments, have thought an Abury or a Stonehenge unworthy of notice in their pages, whether their object was merely to gratify a taste for eloquent description, or a love of the marvellous, or to answer the more solid purpose of theorising upon the character and religion of a new and wild people.

Many of these authors have minutely portrayed the Druidic system in Gaul[2] as well as in Britain; they have dwelt with graphic horror upon the fierce rites and incantations, the forest temples, the savage gods. It is inconceivable, therefore, that they should intentionally, and as if by concert, have been silent upon these the most stupendous features of a foreign superstition. We can hardly evade this difficulty by supposing that such works *escaped* the notice of observant men, especially Cæsar, who, as leader of the earliest invading force, was in continual collision with that fierce and potent hierarchical government which presented the main obstacle to the Roman progress. He it was who spared no effort to eradicate an order that exercised such dangerous influence. He invariably acted upon the method enjoined upon the iconoclasts of the Scripture history,

---

[1] It is impossible to wrest any favourable meaning out of the language of Tacitus in the passage supposed to allude to megalithic works. Ann. xii. 35.

[2] We may add here a remark for which we cannot find a more convenient place, but for which we must not forget to give Mr. Herbert full credit, that though Druidism is described as having been more or less prevalent in every part of Gaul, —Marseilles and Toulouse in the south, and Rheims in the north-east, being its chief strongholds,—the megalithic works which modern learning has pronounced Druidic are to be found only in one north-western province, inhabited by what Sidonius Apollinaris (quoted by Mr. Herbert, p. 27) calls the 'Britons beyond the Loire,' and the seat, after the revolution of 408, of the independent Armorican republic.

Digitized by Google

'to destroy the high places and cut down the groves.' Tacitus expressly tells us 'that the groves sacred to cruel superstitions were cut down:' but says not a word about the destruction, still less of the existence of temples, or other monuments, in any way answering to what, in these days, we call exclusively Druidical. Even the materials of which they were composed might offer a temptation (supposing there had been no other) too strong to be resisted by an active nation of improvers, who could feel no interest in such remains. Here were abundant quarries for the construction of roads, fortifications, or other works, to which their attention was turned. Yet when Aubrey visited Abury in the reign of Charles II., it was almost perfect, and Sir R. Hoare gives a catalogue of those 'Goths' who had carried on the work of destruction there between his own time and that of Dr. Stukeley. Of Stonehenge our own eyes can testify the completeness, if we except only the marks of age and the footprints of the elements.

Such objections, Mr. Herbert thinks, and with much show of reason, to be at once fatal to the Druidic character and the ante-Roman existence of these monuments. Others, who seem to have felt the weight of such evidence, have not put forward their doubts in so distinct a shape. Dr. Lingard, in his remarks upon the Druid religion, says, 'I have not noticed the circles of 'unhewn stones, the remains of which still exist at Stonehenge, 'Abury, &c., because I do not find such stones mentioned by 'ancient writers as appendages to places of worship among the 'Celts.' (Chap. i. n. 32.) For he, like all the rest, shrank from conclusions to which their doubts would have led them. Mr. Turner inclines, though coldly, to the Phœnician theory. The difficulty that strikes every thoughtful writer, without question, is to fix a satisfactory date for these monuments. One is too remote, another too modern. Besides those we have mentioned, the Celts, Belgæ, Saxons, and Danes, have in turn enjoyed the honour of being the founders. Mr. Wilson, in his 'Prehistoric Remains in Scotland,' decides for a still more ancient origin, finding in them and works cognate to them the traces of an 'Allophylian' people, as prior in time to, as different in nature from, the earliest Celts. Even an antediluvian origin has met with its partisans. All, or most, of these would have made them to the Druids and Romans, what they are to us, obsolete and inexplicable.

But do not such various and contrary opinions indicate, Mr. Herbert says, 'an attempt to break away from convictions that press upon us.' An attempt, he adds, which is in great measure prompted and enforced by the 'prepossession' in men's minds that the effects of Christianity would have been

Google

adverse to the erection of such edifices for religious purposes, if we assign them to a period during which the Church exercised any influence in these islands. This 'prepossession' he declares to be unfounded, contending, from the evidence we possess, that the Church had but little authority, or indeed inclination, to use its influence adverse to the bias of the times. (P. 36.) Besides, we may hazard the conjecture (which is not new) that they were not intended as exclusively religious edifices; which, if true, would have prevented Christianity from having more than a nominal influence in the matter.

Having thus disposed of his predecessors' labours, let us see what Mr. Herbert sets up in their place. He has, by the title of his book, as also by his remarks on the mistaken connexion between a rude style and antiquity, which we have above quoted, prepared us in some measure to learn that his 'Cyclops' was a modern, and even partially a Christian. Be this as it may, we shall content ourselves with examining, at present, his theory of the 'reduced antiquity' of these works, which is ingenious, and, we hope we shall be able to show, intelligible. He claims for them a distinct and prominent position in the history of our country, representing them as forming a part of a grand national purpose. The date which he assigns to them is the fifth century of the Christian era, and for the illustration of his doctrine he draws our attention to many extraordinary and special features of this age. But we must not expect to find that he has opened a new mine of information. With all his authorities others have been familiar, but have rejected them. No one before him thought of giving any weight to the narrative of Geoffrey of Monmouth, the Latin translator of Tysilio's 'Chronicle of Kings.' In their contempt for monkish tradition, historians have no doubt neglected many sources of valuable instruction.

Mr. Herbert, however, does not repudiate a fact because it is mixed with falsehood, or turn from his inquiry because explicit statements are not made ready to his hands. He is convinced that history has not been altogether silent upon this subject, if we rightly interpret her pages,—in short, that all, or most, of what we have hitherto been taught to believe, has been invented, 'not in defect of tradition, but in contradiction of all substantial historic fact.' To the guidance of such a pilot, therefore, for a time we cheerfully commit our vessel. We shall not, however, blindly follow in his track, without satisfying ourselves of the depths over which he carries us. But our soundings will not be from mistrust of his experience or skill, so much as from a desire to verify the correctness of the chart which he has given over this dark and untried passage.

Taking, then, the fifth century after Christ as the probable

Digitized by Google

date, let us see what there is on record to corroborate our author's hypothesis.

Sir James Mackintosh sets great value upon the native legends and songs of a people. Niebuhr, Arnold, and Macaulay, from the half-uttered echoes of Rome's antiquity, picture many of the opening scenes of her drama. Mr. Herbert assigns the like importance to the poetry of Britain, as not less genuine because sometimes tinged with the extravagance of monkish fable. The collection of legends in the 'Triads' is well known. The majority of these are of Bardic date, composed by the Bards, who, with the Britons, had fled from the Saxon yoke to an exile among the Welsh mountains, and who were then what their ancestors, the Druids, had been, the sole depositaries of the traditional lore of their nation. Our author's study of this collection enables him to state, that, of those few legends which bear the marks of an ante-Roman age, (such as the absence of Latin names,) and which are, therefore, in strictness, alone *Druidic*, none contain any mention of the 'Great Cor,' or 'Circle of Emmrys,' as Stonehenge is called in the native poetry; or of the name of Merlin, to whose potent spells that mighty work has been vulgarly attributed. On the other hand, the lays of the post-Roman era abound in allusions, under a variety of names, to the achievement of great national works which no antiquary has hitherto hesitated to identify with those under our consideration. Such are 'the raising of the stone of Ceti, 'the building of the work of Emmrys, and the heaping of the 'pile of Cyvangron' (p. 35). This important distinction seems to have been lost sight of by previous writers, from their not having noticed the various style of these compositions.

Besides, throughout the latter series the Bards speak, not as men reverting to times long gone by, but as if the pride and power from which they had fallen, and of which these temples were the sad monuments, were but a yesterday's loss, bewailing them with all the freshness of the Trojan exile's mourning, *Quæque ipse miserrima vidi et quorum pars magna fui.*

Such evidence Mr. Herbert thinks conclusive, as far as it goes, for the recency of those objects which are thus regarded—a recency which at once contradicts the notion of an ante-Druidic existence, which latter, after what has been said, is perhaps the greatest obstacle we have to get over. With the love which these minstrels testify for their religion and its shrines, to suppose that they would 'go and nestle like owls in the forgotten 'ruins of an untold antiquity, claim them as pertaining to their 'own era, and make them the Sion of their harps,' our author justly thinks 'an incredibility' (p. 36).

But besides the testimony of the legends, he has on his side

the professed native historians, the authors of the various 'Bruts,' or Chronicles. We give his general comments on the value of their evidence in his own language :—

'The native authors' [says he] 'declared that the Great Cor was constructed in the latter days of Britannia, after the Roman emperors had ceased to govern her. They did not draw that conclusion from any reasonings or etymologies; for they neither used any such, nor had any pretensions to the capacity of so doing. It is assertion, not inference. They merely stated it because they were told it; and I will add, they were told it because it was so. The traditions of mankind are *primâ facie* true; though obvious motives may raise the presumption of their being in part or even totally false. National vanity is one such motive; and therefore the origin of traditions which magnify the antiquity of national greatness is to be regarded with suspicion and frequent incredulity. Such, for instance, would have been the case had the same authorities assured us that Gomer, son of Japhet, lay buried under these stones. The spirit of exaggerating antiquity was not one from which the Cambro-Britons were exempt; and it is strongly apparent in these very chronicles of Brutus the Trojan and his lineage. Why should not their giant Cors have been sanctified with antiquity as well as all other modes of honour, and have been made the glorious work of Brute, Locrine, or Beli Mawr?'—*Cyclops*, p. 35.

Yet, instead of reading the names of Gomer, Brutus, Hercules, or even King Arthur, in connexion with these works, we here meet with a plain tradition which assigns the 'Great Cor' to the 'latest period of the British nation's existence east of Severn, 'and showing that they had scarcely piled up these giant stones 'when they were expelled (by the Saxon) for ever from the 'lands of their forefathers,' and their religion a second time exiled into the wilds and mountains; an admission, Mr. Herbert exclaims, directly opposed to their national vanity, 'humiliating 'to their nation and its antiquities, and at variance with all 'imaginable motives for falsehood.'

Of all the native chronicles, the 'Brut' of Kings by Tysilio is the most conspicuous for its absurdly fabulous and 'Trojanistic' spirit. Yet affording, as it does, so many proofs of its author's hardy contempt for the trammels of historic truth, and with every disposition in him to the contrary, it contains the plain statement that Stonehenge was erected posterior to the Roman age. The collateral points of the story are palpably fabulous, and the motives, as we shall hereafter show, dissimulative; but the fact remains broadly and undeniably asserted.

His account of it is the following :—That the site of Stonehenge was the scene of the murder and burial of those British chieftains who were slain by Hengest the Saxon, when they had assembled, on the occasion of the festival of the Calanmai, to celebrate the good feeling between the two nations; and that the Bard Merlin afterwards advised the reigning king Emmrys, or Ambrosius, to remove the Giant's Circle from Ireland, and

set it up as a monument over their graves. ('Cyclops,' p. 34.)

Thus much for Mr. Herbert's evidence, with which, as we have said, many, doubtless, have been long as familiar as he; but they feared or failed to draw the conclusion to which it would seem to point. But the great feature of our author's hypothesis is the new light which its development throws upon a long darkened page in our country's annals. We will endeavour to follow our guide as closely as our limits will allow.

It is the fashion amongst historians to represent the weakness of Rome as the *sole* cause of the separation of Britain from the empire under whose dominion she had acquired so much importance, and enjoyed so much prosperity. They suppose that she was left suddenly defenceless, and that, as suddenly, her degenerate sons fell before their hardier foes, the barbarians. But was it so in fact? Was it not rather from her conscious strength, and by her own act, that, in 408, she threw off the conqueror's yoke, and assumed an independent position, so important as to be acknowledged by the Emperor Honorius? We are inclined to believe the only pretence for the above opinion is, that about this period (but before the Roman fall, as well as after it) we, for the first time since the days of Agricola, hear of our island being desolated by barbarian invasion. Yet strong as is the language of Gildas, when describing the invasions of the Scots and Picts, Mr. Herbert thinks that its strictest acceptation will hardly carry their ravages lower than the Latin town of Eboracum, in either of the great inroads previous to the year 446; the chief contests being confined to the northern districts. No towns are said to have been taken, except such fortresses as were connected with the frontier wall, *relictis civitatibus muroque celso.* (P. 74.) Besides, it is fair that Mr. Herbert's opinion should be tried by the event; and we have a right to assume that, had Britain been so weak, the ravages by land would have been extended, and the maritime descents from other countries more frequent; for, as an island, she was peculiarly exposed; and the absence of her late experienced leaders, and the necessarily divided state of her government, would have rendered her an easy prey. Why did not the vast forests of Scandinavia and Germany, now long charged with overflowing multitudes, pour their thousands upon her inviting shores? We may surely infer that we have not the whole truth here; for it is evident that the new state must, considering all its confessed disadvantages, have possessed in itself a means of resistance beyond what we have generally given it credit for, when we find it without a decisive invasion for more than forty years; and even then the foe gained a footing only by invitation from within; while the

final subjugation of the island was deferred for more than a century. No man can deliberately assume that the scanty contingents occasionally sent from Gaul on the urgent demand of the 'groaning Britons,' could do more than they are related to have done; that is, have repaired the ruined wall and repulsed the frontier enemy: they could not have protracted the conquest of a people who were ripe to be conquered.

Mr. Herbert thinks the true account of this phenomenon is to be sought in the nation themselves. He suggests that there had arisen in Britain a great moral convulsion, which, for a time, fused the differences of race and faith under the stronger heat of some all-powerful influence. 'The revolt of the insular and 'Armorican Britannias in 408,' he afterwards remarks, 'was 'an unique event, curious in its nature, and locally, at least, 'momentous . . . . The rest of the empire crumbled away by 'the conquering inroads of the foreigner. But here a conquest 'of the early Cæsars was restored to (and we may add, for a 'time, at least, maintained by) the mixed race of its ancient 'inhabitants and Roman colonists.' (P. 217.)

Religious zeal is one such all-powerful motive. Let us see if this will apply to the case before us. There can be little doubt, he thinks, that the revolution was mainly a religious one, or, rather, that circumstances which, on the failure of the sedition of Maximus and his death, had rendered the overthrow of the Roman power a feasible as well as a desirable object, opened the way under his son Eugenius, (called 'Owen Finddu' in the Triads), and the auspices of the fanatic mother of the latter,—a British 'Helena'—to the re-establishment of the old native superstition. The parties in the field were the remnants of the Druidic body, existing hitherto beyond the Roman pale, small in numbers and weakened by the persecution of more than four centuries, but strong in the prestige of an ancient title, and elated by the weakness of their bitterest foes. On the other hand, the Christians, though perhaps superior in numbers, had been of late weakened by division and heresy, particularly that of Pelagius, and had besides lost the support which the liberal state-religion of Rome had afforded them. Both were anxious to assert and extend their faith. It was not for the interest of either to maintain a contest of intolerance between themselves, which must expose both to the attacks of the vast force of Paganism which lay beyond and around them. Is it improbable that there might have been a compromise between them (with all due submission we advance such a topic), in the first place, intended as an extraordinary remedy, and suggested by common danger and national sympathy—one, too, which seemed feasible without great sacrifice of principle on either side, though the

ulterior results may have proved untoward? On the side of the Church we cannot imagine there would have been much difficulty. Its proselytising spirit and ready adoption of national prejudices is a fact above the necessity of proof. The compromise, which, as we believe, would have been the result of the Judaizing tendencies of some even of the apostles, had it not been denounced and overborne by the fearless character of S. Paul, had been attempted, we know, at a later time, and with fatal success, in the case of the Gnostics in the East, and Platonists in Egypt, and so it was, we may suppose, in Britain.

It must be always borne in mind that we are now only endeavouring to interpret our author's conjectures. He frankly confesses that the whole period is a blank in every annalist. 'It is 'manifest,' he remarks, 'that British history has been com-'pletely falsified in its chronicles, and that another and more 'true history was formerly known, which a Nennius and a 'Tysilio did not think good for our edification, and of which the 'memory is now lost.' (*Britannia after the Romans*, p. 35.) His theory, therefore, at present, rests on such bare gleanings of evidence as his industry has collected. More than this could not be said of much that Niebuhr wrote. It will be for further research to determine the measure of our faith, or the extent of our adhesion.

The chief points of historical evidence to which Mr. Herbert refers for a confirmation of this, his view, are the following:— 'It is almost the precise time,' he says, 'of Britain's separation 'from the Empire that the paschal schism is said to have arisen 'there upon the suggestion of Sulpicius Severus. See *S. Adhelm 'Epist. ad Gerontium*, and *Usher, Index Chron. in anno* 410, p. '219.' We have it on record that the British Church up to the time of Constantine had, in conformity with the Nicene decree, celebrated Easter on the 16th day of the month, corresponding in a cycle of 84 years to the Jewish Nisan; (*Epist. of Const. Ad omnes Ecclesias, Spelman. Conc.* p. 45, quoted by Mr. Herbert, *Brit. after the Romans*, p. 42;) while at a later period we find its members incurring the charge of heresy as *Quartodecimans*, for adopting the Jewish celebration on the 14th day. If this change had occurred under the Roman system, we should have found it alluded to in historical or theological writers. Mr. Herbert therefore assigns it to the days of confusion and dismemberment contemporary with Sulpicius, and quotes the authority of Archbishop Usher. (*Brit. Eccl.* p. 483, *ed.* 1687.) That prelate refers the advice of Sulpicius in this matter to a desire of obtaining a medium between the discordant computes of Alexandria and Rome. From this Mr. Herbert dissents, but it matters little to us what was the object. The fact of Britain's separation from

the Latin communion before, and independently of, the Saxon conquest, is all we have to do with, and that he thinks indisputable.

Gildas, an authority certainly not in general favourable to our author's views, expressly mentions the deplorable apostasy of the Britons during the years succeeding their revolt from Rome. His words, 'Non gentium diis perspicue litant,' are not without a very remarkable meaning in the mouth of a sincere Churchman though bigoted historian.

An important corroboration of the above view is to be found in Mr. Herbert's construction of the 'Apology of Bacharius,' published in Muratori's *Anecd. Bibl. Ambrosiana,* and quoted in *Brit. after the Romans,* p. 117. This extraordinary document is an apology purporting to be addressed to the Apostolic See by a man who, coming forth, like Abraham from among the Chaldees, from a nation whose reputation for heresy and sin was only too well known, feels it necessary to vindicate himself from the leprous taint which common opinion supposed him to have contracted. Strange to say, the writer never breathes the *name* of his country! Africa and Spain have been mentioned as the probable scenes of Bacharius' strictures. But in the former, Mr. Herbert argues, heresy was (if at all) prevalent only among the descendants of the Vandal conquerors, the main body of the population being, as is well known, sincerely attached to the true faith: while in Spain, the voice of Priscillianism had been twice lately hushed by the assembled Church of the nation, so that no Spaniard *could* have spoken of his country as Bacharius does. Mr. Herbert cannot discover any other nation deserving at that time such sweeping reproach besides our own. In confirmation of this view, constant positive tradition identifies Bacharius with an illustrious member of the insular Church, Mochta the Briton. The exact date of this apology is not determined, but in another work, written by him in 460, Bacharius describes himself as then an old man.

By way of illustrating the nature of the national heresy, we may add that as late as the year 1102, in the archiepiscopate of Anselm, we read, among the minutes of two successive Councils of London, a decree directed against the worship of fountains, 'and especial mention made of two where the practice condemned had chiefly prevailed.' Dr. Henry remarking on these passages says, though without giving authority, that such a practice was held to have been a relic of *Druidic superstition.* B. III. c. ii. s. 3.

Lastly, we have proof *a posteriori* that *something,* be it what it may, had suddenly changed the aspect as well as the fortunes of our island. She, who had been the favoured province of Constantine, Theodosius and Maximus, within a few years of the

Roman overthrow sinks into gloom and oblivion, and 'seems,' says Mr. Herbert, 'to have returned into the bosom of that '*ultra-mundane* Oceanus in which she had lain, "quite divided 'from the whole world," until the arms of Claudius dragged her 'into Europe.' (*Brit. after the Romans*, p. 143.) For many years we are chiefly indebted to the mention, in foreign authors, of the British colony in Armorica, that the name of *Briton* meets our ear. The voice of history having ceased, the British isles become the privileged region of fable; and in one legend they are, what the Cimmerian Chersonese was to the ancients—a Hades on earth—to which the souls of the dead were ferried over sea by unseen boatmen; while in another they are described as abandoned to the range of fierce and poisonous beasts. (Cf. *Procopius* with *Tzetzes' Comm. on Lycophron*, quoted by Mr. Herbert, *Brit. after the Romans*, p. 143.)

We have digressed thus far in order to do full justice to what must be considered as the key of our author's position, viz. the convulsion of national feeling in Britain after the revolt from Rome, which convulsion he endeavours to show was connected with, if not greatly dependent on, an attempt to restore the old Druidic system, to which the Church, too weak to resist, submitted on terms of compromise. Mr. Herbert has, we believe, discussed this question, and the general features of the age to which it belongs, at length in his 'Essay on the Neo-Druidic heresy,' but we carefully avoid entering on such a topic in our present 'connexion.' Those, who are curious on this subject, must be content to search for themselves in those books we have already quoted. We shall delay no more in speculating on details where our information must necessarily be scarce, and the ground somewhat delicate. We must leave it to our readers to determine whether or not our author has in his 'pleadings' stated a sufficiently colourable case, as to the date and causes of the works in question.

Dr. Robertson, noticing some of the excesses consequent on the eager adoption of the Reformed doctrines by the vulgar, remarks that we who live at such a distance of time can hardly realise the effects which a new fanaticism would, under such circumstances, be likely to produce. If Mr. Herbert's historical deductions be just, he may well call upon us to consider ere we condemn his theory,—remembering (in spite of Mr. Smee) that there are as yet no laws discovered to which the human will or heart are amenable, especially in an age of strange and striking combinations, of intense religious zeal, shameless dissimulation, and recklessness of means, which overbore all opposition, silenced or excluded waverers, and bonded together the votaries in an union of almost mystical strength. An age distinguished by such features is sure to mark its era in history by mighty monuments.

The enthusiasm of Mahomet carried his followers to distant conquest; in Britain a similar spirit may have led the nation to erect those fierce and stupendous memorials which have alike puzzled antiquaries and philosophers.

The duration of this extraordinary age Mr. Herbert extends from the year of freedom, in 408, to the final triumph of the Saxons about the year 550. He finds united in this 'era of 'splendour and sin,' to use his own graphic language, 'nearly all 'the possible requisites for his proposition,—an advanced state 'of human science'—the great bequest of the departed Roman —'considerable resources existing in the country, the inde- 'pendent use of them, and a public mind of great and energetic 'aberration.' (P. 75.) This latter quality, he thinks, will account for 'the means of performance and the motives of it'—our greatest moral difficulties—as well as for the specific style and character which the works assumed. For where, argues he, a certain style of architecture wants the *indicia* belonging to a progressive course of art, where it does not hinge upon inventions improving the capacity, but upon motives 'actuating the will,' there we must be prepared to find that an extraordinary cause will produce an extraordinary effect. This would appear to be eminently so in the case before us—that of a 'fanatical 'and enthusiastic people, constructing a new policy after ages 'of dependence, and a new religion out of two old ones.' 'From 'whom that people borrowed their idea, what moved them to 'adopt such a style in preference to others easier and more 'elegant, and how old it was among those from whom they 'borrowed?' these, Mr. Herbert confesses to be 'questions more or less difficult.' We quote his own words as furnishing an attempted interpretation of the difficulty.

'The entire (megalithic) system,' he remarks, 'as it was 'introduced among the Britons in the last days of the Western 'Empire, perhaps never existed anywhere else, even in regard of 'the forms which it assumed, but much less in regard of the 'feelings with which it was connected. There was this difference, 'that elsewhere it exhibited the natural materials and rude 'fashion of a real simplicity, whereas here (in Britain) it exhi- 'bits the deliberate choice and fanatical zeal of a people more 'advanced in civility.' (P. 233.) From whatever quarter it travelled to our shores—and it is very likely connected with the North Western migrations (for in their wake alone can anything cognate to it be found),—it is certain that those nations possessed only the rudiments of what the Britons under the high pressure of their enthusiastic spirit carried much further.

To his second question the best answer we can make is simply to refer to the history. Under the circumstances of so great a revolution as that which we have above supposed, it was not

likely that men would be satisfied without a visible and striking image of their new common faith. 'Let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven,' was the general cry of those who, in the pride of their new state, feared the time when they might be 'scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.' The demand for the marvellous and gigantic was not to be contented with any existing form, whether Christian or Druidic, but by common consent they adopted one they found traditionally connected with the family of nations to which the mass of the people belonged. Here, Mr. Herbert thinks, we may trace the Druid, or rather Bardic, influence. At so small a sacrifice did they in great measure restore the supremacy of their order,—the substitution of stones for trees—the lasting material for the perishable,—and of the solitude of the plain for the silent gloom of the forest! At the distance of eleven centuries, as Aubrey gazed upon the unbroken avenues of stones, they offered to his eyes as forcible an image as ever of the grove which, (as suggested,) they were designed to represent; while, in confirmation of such a theory, tradition and prejudice have to this day stamped such works as exclusively Druidical.

The adoption of such a style of architecture was eminently fitted for the other uses to which the supposed new constitution will have intended to devote those mighty 'Babels.' We have before alluded to the possibility of their being of a mixed sacred and political character. Hitherto with the old priesthood of Britain and Gaul, as in Egypt and India, religious faith had been rather a matter of philosophic teaching, unexplained and unappreciated by the vulgar. The fashion of Christianity had rendered the publicity and popularity of a creed a necessary condition of its existence, and the advantage of combining civil with religious institutions had been duly felt and approved. Hence, in the Neo-Druidic period, the central seat of national worship became, as in ancient Greece, the 'Panionium' of the British name, community of faith being here as there interpreted as the surest earnest of community of interest. Stonehenge (whatever may have been the use of Abury) was, from its situation, admirably adapted for such a twofold purpose. And it may be as Mr. Herbert suggests, that the seat of civil government was transferred to Ambri, or Ambresbury, (now Amesbury,) hard by, for such a reason. The 'Head of Bran,'—the mystical type of the kingdom—was said to have been concealed at 'Caer Caradoc,' which a Welsh writer (quoted, 'Cyclops,' p. 221,) expressly calls the 'Mount of Ambri.' Geoffrey of Monmouth explains it as 'Salisbury,' by a vulgar error confusing everything on Salisbury Plain with Sarum. Hence the 'Great Cor' is, on the one hand, 'the great circle

Digitized by Google

'of dominion' (we quote the language of the legends), 'the 'central place of precious stones;' figurative expressions, which obviously describe it as the national assembly; while the name Mynydd Dewis, 'Mount of Election,' would seem to point to it as the 'Scone' of the British kings, where those creatures of the priesthood were anointed by the Bardic hierarchy, and perhaps the surrounding barrows mark their places of sepulture. Among the poetic expressions which shadow forth its religious character, we find such as the 'walls of the Eternal, the melodious quaternion of Peter' (the rock or stone of the Church, as Mr. Herbert interprets it, p. 88). What have we here but an embodiment of the combined majesty of Church and State? We now see a structure which does not dishonour so grand an aim, and discern a purpose worthy to be recorded by so stupendous a monument!

We may naturally feel curious, after following our author in his present ingenious attempt at the restoration of historic truth, to learn what he has to tell us of the previous mutilation of the building, and why it is that such scanty fragments present themselves to the antiquary's notice. The experienced reader need not be told that such a case is probably only one among many, where truth has been obscured by the passions and prejudices of mankind. Look at comparatively modern times—the Cathedral of Cologne dates from no earlier period than the wane of the Middle Ages; yet, though our interest has been excited to the utmost in its behalf, we, as yet, know no more of its early history than ignorance, superstition, or dissimulation will vouchsafe to us. The motives, however, for the concealment of the real history of Britain during the fifth century may at least be guessed at, and the examination of such of them as bear upon our subject, will form, we hope, no inappropriate conclusion to our present remarks.

Mr. Herbert has shown how Britain's birthday of independence was celebrated by a vigorous attempt at self-government and self-defence, and how in their desire of temporary union, the leaders of the movement showed themselves designedly careless of the means by which an end was attained. That a calamitous termination should ere long crown so time-serving a policy may be easily conceived. Fanatical zeal for the hour covered, but could not exclude, schism and discord. The nation, awakening from its delirium, was a house divided against itself, and fell under the curse incident to such a condition. The declamatory style of Gildas may, after all, contain no great exaggeration of the miseries that ensued. We read there of folly, extravagance, depravity, and apostasy; of the antagonism between a proud priesthood, and weak, but haughty monarchs, descendants of Caractacus and Boadicea; while barbarian inva-

ders, incessantly hovering on the frontier, wearied out all the efforts of a divided and oppressed people. Then the ever-fatal device of matching one foe against another introduced the Saxon to devour the now easy prey. These were truths too bitter to find a ready chronicler. Besides, the days of heathenism and darkness which followed destroyed the means (had even the wish existed) of commemorating the national ruin. Hence, except by tradition, the truth was scarce remembered. But it was reserved to a far later age to interpolate a positive falsehood in its place. Such an attempt was made by Tysilio, in his 'Chronicle of Kings,' published some time in the eighth century. The short account there given of the 'Cor Emmrys,' and which we have quoted, affords a forcible instance of what Mr. Herbert calls 'dissimulation' in a historian,—namely, that he clothes his facts with so much falsehood as to create a suspicion of the facts themselves. He could not conceal the truth that the site of Stonehenge was the scene of the well-known tragedy of the bloody 'Calanmai,'—that event had made the 'Great Cor' a subject of too painful interest for a historian to pass it in silence, as he has Abury, or to assign to it a mere fabulous origin. Forced to give thus much truth, he atones for the confession by describing it as a recent monument[1] erected after the Saxon Conquest by piety and patriotism to the fallen flower of British valour;—affecting to be ignorant that it had, in fact, existed long before as the temple of false religion, and that those who had perished there were not devoted leaders, but men who, for their own selfish ends, and by their fanatical policy and teaching, had brought the nation to disunion, defeat, and exile. Everything conspired to assist in establishing the ingenious fraud. The name under which the place was known by the Britons was entirely forgotten, or carefully concealed, with the memory of their disgrace, while one which the Saxon[2] had given to the monument in his hour of triumph—a name derived from that of his successful leader—survived and continued, and was adopted by Tysilio and Geoffrey, the Latin translator of the 'Brut,' the latter being perhaps ignorant of the true etymology, or, what is more likely, as Mr. Herbert remarks, reading it as 'Hanging Stones.' Of course in Saxon

[1] 'It existed when that event occurred,' says Mr. Herbert, 'of which it is feigned to be a memorial, although it became, as it were, a monument to those who were there buried. So the church of Ste. Genevieve has been made, though it was not built, a mausoleum; and special motives have operated to banish from discourse, and partly from recollection, its original character. This may serve for imperfect illustration.'—P. 85.

[2] The advocates of the Druidic theory seem not to have considered that there is any inconsistency between the character of the people to whom they ascribe the erection of these stones, and the name which they bear. For that is evidently Saxon; and a passage in Dugdale, where the reading is 'Stanhengest,' confirms Mr. Herbert's interpretation of 'Stones of Hengest.'

England nothing but the Saxon appellation prevailed, and thus the misnomer and the falsehood have passed down the stream of history. But Mr. Herbert, learned in the poetry of Wales, the native land of his house, brings to bear upon the false teaching of the 'Brut' the indignant refutation of the later Bards. These fierce enthusiasts, whose sons and grandsons knew so well how to fire the patriotism of their countrymen against the yoke of the 'ruthless' Edward, could not, without equal disdain, brook the faint-heartedness of those who, to conceal the memorials of defeat, introduced a lie upon their annals, and obscured the 'storied' monument of the high deeds and proud bearing of their order during its second sway, after the fall of the 'men of Cæsar.' Cynddelw, the arch-Bard of Powys, at the close of the twelfth century, thus vented his detestation of Tysilio and his school:

> 'A copious bard sings sweetly your praise,—
> A song without separation (*i.e.* schism), without deception;
> A lofty song, without quietness, without silence;
> *Not the detested song of the followers of Tysilio.*'—(P. 42.)

We must conclude. We cannot but feel that we have still left much unnoticed in our author's treatise; but our desire to confine ourselves to the most popular view of his subject must be our excuse. Thus we have neglected the megalithic system, as it appears in the Gallic province on the other side the Channel; a study of which would suggest a much closer connexion between the *uterque Britannus* than historians have hitherto remarked. We have passed over, too, Mr. Herbert's onslaught upon the mighty fallacy of the 'Dracontian Temples,'—the pet discovery of Dr. Stukeley,—and which many succeeding antiquaries have taken without a murmur—and, àpropos of that, the dishonesty and oftentimes the ignorance of that learned Doctor. All which are 'mighty interesting,' as old Pepys would say, and may reward the patient reader. It is a fault inherent, perhaps, in the nature of Mr. Herbert's work, that on many points, even relating to his immediate subject, it is rather suggestive than conclusive; and this has necessarily led to a want of arrangement which has, we are bound to say, added much to our present task of interpretation. Further, in all that he has advanced we are not inclined to concur; but we repeat that the desire to do justice to the stride here made in antiquarianism has led us thus far to follow his guidance. And we think that, all things considered, we shall have no longer need to blush for our countrymen in their treatment of subjects like the present, when, in answer to the oft-repeated question, 'What mean these stones?' we point to this production, and compare it with the models of learning and patient labour of our German neighbours.

Digitized by Google

ART. II.—*The History of Mary Queen of Scots. By* F. A. MIGNET. 2 vols. London: Bentley.

AMONGST all the modes of settling a dispute, and satisfying the earnest longing for justice which disturbs the heart of man, perhaps the old method, by single combat, presents most points of immediate satisfaction. There is something so entirely congenial to the feelings in seeing a cause personified, and adequately represented. Much of this present satisfaction is experienced when we find in the page of history some grand struggle maintained, some vital question worked out, by men alive to their responsibilities, equal to the important interests they support, and with minds and tempers akin to the principles they advocate. Such a combat and such champions we find in the period we are now called on to consider—a period not less remarkable for the mighty interests involved in the battle then fought out, than for the personal qualities of those engaged in it, and their singular adaptation to the parts they severally played. It may be said, indeed, that circumstances have the power of moulding characters and fitting them to the form assigned them, but the adaptation here is something much more particular and appropriate. Had any of the leading characters in this drama changed places, we see that the results might have been altogether different, and these differences of such magnitude, as to alter the whole face of society abroad and at home, even down to the present day.

The course of events connected with the unhappy queen whose character is the subject of our article, by turns brings before us all the principal personages of that period; around her they often group themselves, and with her all were intimately concerned; so closely, indeed, that the contact always develops their inner nature, unmasks their designs and motives, and tests and tries them, as some great power of nature tests every substance that is brought within its influence. It is a test popularly considered fatal to the magnanimity of our great Elizabeth, and to the disinterestedness of Scotland's great statesman: a test to bring out in glaring relief all the fierceness of Knox's nature; to reveal the secret sources of France's duplicity; and the cruelty, the treachery, the ambition of Spain; and to make manifest the utter corruption which lay on the surface at least of the old religion, and to expose every failure of sincerity, reverence, and charity, in that form which superseded it. False herself, Mary of Scotland is yet the mirror of

truth to those who approach her; we see in every instance the bad in blacker colours, and the pure gold of the best sullied by an alloy, which need not have been detected, but for the severe trial she brings them to.

The fair, candid, impartial mind finds in the records of Mary and her times lessons of such rare interest and importance, such a far and clear insight into persons, motives, and the secret springs of great events, as will repay the toils of the most laborious search. But for any real good, for the ascertaining of truth, for fulfilling any of the uses and purposes of history, candour and impartiality are so important, are indispensable in so stringent a sense of the term, that we may say it is better not to study them at all, than to do so in any other spirit; and experience shows us how hard it is for those who bring themselves within reach of Mary's fascinations, to preserve these qualities. For her beauty lives still: three hundred years have passed, and her smiles and tears have yet power to move the heart, and to pervert the judgment. Those well-known features reign over the imagination as though we beheld them with our eyes; we look in her face and forget, not only all that can be said, but, alas! all that can be proved, against her. If this be so now, it was surely a happy thing for England that while all this beauty lived and breathed, our country lay under a woman's rule. Most unfortunate Mary must have deemed it. No king could have withstood the temptation once to behold those charms, no man could have resisted their influence. What would have been the end, who can tell? Had she once came a suppliant before him, the world might have seen the ancient tale realized—

> 'In robe and crown the king came down
> To meet and greet her on her way;
> "It is no wonder," said the lords,
> "She is more beautiful than day."'

And so she might have slid into the unguarded throne, which she never abandoned the hope of one day possessing. Even Elizabeth seems to have known that her safety lay in distance, that it was risking too much to indulge a natural curiosity. We can hardly, indeed, overrate what might have been Mary's living power under favouring circumstances, when we see to what an extent her fascinations blind the moral sense of her historians and apologists at this distant period of time; when we note the tender names they give to her errors, what efforts they make to elude them, how shrinkingly they approach the mention of them, how hastily they pass them over, how petulantly unjust it renders them to all beside, applying all the severer moral standard to her fellow-actors for the licence they allow themselves in her solitary exceptional case.

Digitized by Google

M. Mignet, her latest biographer, and whose work, ably condensing as it does much new matter, has given the subject a fresh interest, is better described as Mary's admirer than her apologist; for having a taste, and, we must believe also, a tender conscience, for historic accuracy, there is no want of fairness to complain of in his detail of the facts of his heroine's story; her worst enemy (the epithet invariably applied to every conscientious believer in Mary's guilt in the one great transaction of her life) never brought together so great a weight of evidence against her. In fact, he believes all the bad she has ever been charged with. The remarkable point in M. Mignet is, that this conviction of guilt in no way seems to affect his feelings towards her. She still occupies in his mind the niche of injured innocence and virtue. Now and then, it is true, the urgency of the case drags from him some unwilling phrases of condemnation; but the *tone* of his work is sympathising admiration. We know not what may be the secret cause for this perverted judgment. Whether it is to be found in his pride, as a Frenchman, in Mary's beauty and grace, herself half a Frenchwoman by birth, and wholly by education; or whether it proceeds from an equally patriotic hatred of Elizabeth as a main author of our national greatness, it is not easy to decide; probably both these motives have their influence; certain it is that Elizabeth gets all the hard words, is the object of all the virtuous indignation our author has to bestow; and that the same faults which in Mary are passed over without comment, or even sometimes with a lofty tribute of praise to her talent, ingenuity, and matchless resources, are in Elizabeth denounced in a storm of righteous censure. The course of our narrative will afford sufficient proof of this, without lingering at the outset to substantiate our charge. We who are compelled, however ungallantly, to take Mignet's facts,—borne out as they are by every trustworthy previous history,—and to form our own severer conclusions upon them, must proceed, without further delay, to detail these facts as recent search has confirmed, and thrown new light upon them; first attempting to show that in spite of the elegance of Mary's education, and the apparent promise of her youth, there was nothing in her early training to render the darker pages of his history impossible, nor more uncongenial and unnatural than great crimes must always be, when we set ourselves deliberately, and in cool blood, to account for them.

Mary is universally called unfortunate and unhappy—too often, to screen her from severer and more appropriate epithets. But unhappy and unfortunate she may be truly called in the circumstances of her childhood and of her education. For what

Digitized by Google

greater mishap could have befallen a beautiful and innocent child, than to be taken from a mother's care to be reared in the bosom of the Court of France, under the eye and immediate superintendence of her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine, the most infamous member of the house of Guise, and under the maternal care and example of her mother-in-law, Catharine of Medici, that type and byword of falsehood and cruel treachery? Of this court M. Mignet gives us the following picture:—

'This court was then the most magnificent, the most elegant, the most joyous, and, we must add, the most lax in Europe. Still retaining certain military customs of the middle ages, and at the same time conforming to the intellectual usages of the time of the *renaissance*, it was half-chivalric and half-literary, mingling tournaments with studies, hunting with erudition, mental achievements with bodily exercises, the ancient and rough games of skill and strength with the novel and delicate pleasures of the arts. Nothing could equal the splendour and vivacity which Francis I. had introduced into his court, by attracting thither all the principal nobility of France, by educating as pages therein young gentlemen of all the provinces, by adorning it with nearly two hundred ladies belonging to the greatest families in the kingdom, and by establishing it sometimes in the splendid palaces of Fontainebleau and S. Germain, which he had either built or beautified on the banks of the Seine, and sometimes in the spacious castles of Blois and Amboise, which his predecessors had inhabited on the banks of the Loire. A careful imitator of his father's example, Henry II. kept up the same magnificence at his court, which was presided over with as much grace as activity by the subtle Italian, Catherine de Medici, whose character had been formed by Francis I., who had admitted her into the *petite bande de ses dames favorites* with whom he used to hunt the stag, and frequently sport with alone in his pleasure-houses! The men were constantly in the company of the women; the queen and her ladies were present at all the games and amusements of Henri II. and his gentlemen, and accompanied them in the chase. The king, on his part, together with the noblemen of his retinue, used to pass several hours every morning and evening in the apartments of Catherine de Medici. "There," says Brantôme, "there was a host of human goddesses, some more beautiful than the others; every lord and gentleman conversed with her whom he loved best; whilst the king talked to the queen, his sister, the Dauphiness, (Mary Stuart,) and the princesses together with those lords and princes who were seated nearest him." As the kings themselves had avowed mistresses, they were desirous that their subjects should follow their example, "and if they did not do so," says Brantôme, "they considered them coxcombs and fools." '—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 37.

It is of this court, and its influence upon the susceptible mind of childhood, that M. Mignet ventures to say, that Mary 'during this period only gained benefit from it,' (p. 40,) as if, because she was not old enough to take an active share in its immoralities, that therefore her moral sense was not infected by the atmosphere in which she lived. Whereas it was this union of elegance and polish with deep depravity which constituted its chief danger. She might under another aspect have learnt to view sin with horror and disgust; but in this gay domestic social scene

Digitized by Google

of wickedness, in which even religion was by no means shut out, and was universally acknowledged and respected, such a foundation of laxity and tolerance of evil was laid, as offers the readiest solution for all the subsequent errors of her life. Mary had infinite charms and graces, but there is hardly any indication of her possessing a conscience; as far as in them lay, those polished princes and cardinals strangled it in the cradle, to make her more like themselves, more the creature of their designs. Nothing is more fearful amongst these masters of dissimulation and profligacy, of which that bad court furnished so many examples, than the absence of remorse after their ill deeds are done. Less sinners show us a mind in torment, full of anguish, if not repentance, when the tempter abandons them to their fate; but these gigantic criminals, these wholesale plotters, and poisoners, and assassins, who filled the earth with their deeds of violence, seem to have been able to sustain their courage and their audacity to the end. No lifted veil reveals what should have been the terrors of Charles IX.'s last hours: he died calmly, his hand clasped in that of his mother Catharine. We might call it an exemplary end, but that there is no sign, no confession, not one symptom of repentance for one of the blackest crimes that disgrace our nature. And the reason for this must be that with them the very salt had lost its savour; their religion was corrupt, as being disconnected with purity of life. Party spirit, no less than self-indulgence, led to this fatal result. With many a grievous failing in Christian love and charity, the Reformers did yet preach morality; and because they did so, and had used the universal decay of it as a powerful weapon against the religion in power, therefore those in spiritual high places did too often only the more defy and disregard the moral precepts of the Gospel, only the more held monstrous transgressions of purity and truth as venial, because that opposite party sternly upheld them. And when Mary early learnt to abhor John Knox, and to reverence and to yield herself to the guidance of her profligate uncle, she learnt, alas! at the same time, to hate along with him the stern moral law which he preached. She learnt to form a wholly different standard of what constituted a faithful child of the Church; and in spite of the sins of her life, it does not seem that according to her own judgment she ever fell short of it.

The difficulties which exist against forming a correct and unanimous judgment on the character of this queen cannot certainly be attributed to a want of materials. No period of history was ever laid more bare, more completely exposed for subsequent investigation; and this constantly in the very handwriting of the parties most concerned. What was scarcely

Digitized by Google

whispered three hundred years ago, is now proclaimed on the house-tops—plots and dark designs, which it would have been rack, and torture, and death to reveal then, all the world may now peruse in all the comfort of fair type and drawing-room security. The schemes against this nation in particular, what Mary wrote to Philip, and Philip wrote to the Pope, and all that the Pope replied, and all that Alva advised and projected, which would once have made the faint-hearted give up their country for lost, are now food for easy triumph or amused speculation. In addition to the innumerable histories and narratives contemporary, or composed at intervals for different ends down to the present current year, we are informed by Prince Labanoff that in our State-paper Office alone the letters and papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots, collected and classed with the greatest care in chronological order, amount to sixty-nine bound folio volumes. The archives of France and Spain also contribute their share of curious confirmation. Mary's own letters which have escaped to this time amount to 736, and in the midst of documents of little interest, formal announcements, demands for safe-conduct, and professions of friendship, which flowed so readily from Mary's pen, and meant so little, are some which reveal her very heart; letters written in the heat of passion, and with a startling force of expression which brings her whole soul before us—and many equally remarkable for dignity of remonstrance, for a clear terse statement of facts, and for readiness in turning those facts to her own advantage. At a time when most ladies could not write a letter at all; when they could neither spell the words, nor compose a sentence, nor knew how to use these accomplishments for the purpose of expressing their thoughts, had they possessed them, Mary was an accomplished letter-writer; the pen was her weapon,—her letters, as compositions, may stand a comparison with those of the wisest and greatest men of her time. She began to write early, and the melancholy circumstances of her life, and her own indomitable spirit and restless temper, kept her in continual practice. Writing was the occupation of her life.

We need not remind our readers that Mary, a 'beautiful infant' in her sixth year, accompanied by her 'four Maries,' the daughters of noble Scotch houses, of the same age and name as herself, after being affianced to the Dauphin, was committed by her mother, Mary of Lorraine and Queen Dowager of Scotland, to the care of her relations and the French king, to be educated in her adopted country till she was of age to complete the marriage contract:—a measure deemed necessary from the disturbed state of Scotland, and the constant attempts of each party to obtain possession of the person of the young queen.

Digitized by Google

In France she received an education fitted to develop every gift of nature.

'She early displayed the varied gifts of her rich and charming nature. At ten years of age she astonished all who knew her by her maturity, and wrote to the Queen Dowager with delicate and precocious good sense. When thirteen years old she recited a Latin speech of her own composition in presence of the King, the Queen, and the whole Court, in the hall of the Louvre.'—*Ibid.* p. 41.

And again:—

'Her mental and personal attractions were early developed. She was tall and beautiful; her eyes beamed with intelligence and sparkled with animation. She had the most elegantly shaped hands in the world. Her voice was sweet, her appearance noble and graceful, and her conversation brilliant. She early displayed those charms which were destined to make her an object of universal admiration, and which rendered even her infancy seductive. She had been brought up with the daughters of Catherine de Medici, and under the superintendence of the learned Margaret of France, the sister of Henry II.'—*Ibid.* p. 36.

She was educated with great care. She understood and spoke Latin with facility—she had considerable knowledge of history, knew several living languages, and we learn from Brantôme that she had a fine poetical taste.

'She loved poetry and poets; but, above all, M. de Ronsard, M. du Bellay, and M. de Maisonfleur, who have written beautiful verses and elegies on her. She herself composed and wrote verses, of which I have seen some beautiful and well written. She sang very well, accompanying herself on the lute, which she touched very prettily with that beautiful white hand of hers, and those fair well-shaped fingers.'—*Ibid.* p. 43.

Her uncle, the Cardinal, thus writes of her to his sister, the Queen Dowager of Scotland, when she had attained her tenth year:—

'After having assured you of the prosperity and health of the said lords, I will tell you those things which are most important to yourself, and from which you will receive most pleasure and satisfaction. It is, that the said lady, your daughter, is so grown, and indeed increases every day in height, goodness, beauty, wisdom, and virtues, that she is as perfect and accomplished in all things honest and virtuous as it is possible for her to be, and there is no one like her to be found, either among noble ladies or others, of what low or mean condition they may be. And I am constrained to tell you, Madame, that the King takes such a liking to her, that he often amuses himself in chatting with her for an hour at a time, and she knows as well how to entertain him with good and wise conversation as any woman of five-and-twenty would.'—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 9.

And going on to make arrangements with his sister for forming a separate establishment for her, suited to her rank, not being satisfied with the existing state of things:—

'I advise that there should be nothing superfluous in the order of it, nor yet mean or sordid, which is what she hates more than anything in the world. And believe me, Madame, she has already so high and noble a

Digitized by Google

courage, that she makes great demonstrations of being vexed, seeing herself in this inferior position, and for this reason desires to see herself removed from the present guardianship, and to live in authority.'

And at the end of the same letter:—

'As for me, Madame, all my happiness will lie in serving the mother and the daughter, and I will always attend to what it will please you to command me, and I hope so to manage that you shall be content. I only beg you, Madame, to believe me satisfied that never was a daughter calculated to give greater contentment, or better brought up; and I must not conceal from you that Madame de Parroys (her governess) does the best that it is possible to do, and be sure that God is well served, and after the old fashion. The bearer of this will tell you of the harangue which the queen, your daughter, made to the king.'—*Ibid.* p. 14.

Elsewhere he says:—

'I can assure you, Madame, that there is no one more beautiful and more virtuous than the Queen, your daughter; she governs both the King and the Queen.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 36.

It was probably unhappy for Mary's moral training that she was so charming and so teachable. Besides the importance for their own ends, which was the primary motive with her guardians, there was a positive pleasure in witnessing her aptitude for the part they designed her to play, and her quickness and docility in receiving their lessons: the earliest lesson of this school—the great weapon of their policy—the art to be initiated into with the first dawn of reason and pursued and perfected through life, being duplicity and dissimulation. This poor child at ten showed herself no mean proficient—she showed herself at least thoroughly alive to its importance, and jealous of her own credit in this particular. There is something at once pretty and melancholy in the following letter to her mother, written at ten years old, which is justly quoted as an evidence of her precocious talent, and with less reason, for the *promise* which these early years held out. Children dearly love a secret, it is quite congenial to their nature to have mysteries, and with requisite training they may become early adepts at concealment. It was Mary's misfortune, rather than her fault, that this natural propensity should have been cultivated and developed, and set off to her own mind with a great show of duty towards her mother:—

'1552.

'Madame,—I have received the letters which you have been pleased to write to me by Aztus Asquin, by which I have learnt the pleasure you have felt that I have kept secret the things which it pleased you to send me. I can assure you, Madame, that nothing that comes from you shall be known by me (*ne sera sceu par moy*). . . . . I humbly beg you to believe that I shall not fail to obey you in everything in which you are pleased to command me, and to think that the chief wish I have in the world is to be obedient and agreeable to you, doing you every possible service as I am bound. I have seen, by your letters, that you beg me to approve the marriage-gift of the late M. Asquin to his son, who is here. I humbly

Digitized by Google

entreat you never to give me anything but your commands, as to your very humble and very obedient daughter and servant, for otherwise I shall not think I have the happiness of being in your good graces. As for my master, I will do as you have told me. I have shown the letters you have been pleased to write to me to my uncle, Monsieur de Guise, thinking that you would wish it, though, after the directions you have given me, I should not have shown them but that I was afraid I could not arrange things without his help. I write two other letters with my own hand; the one concerning Mde. de Paroys, and the other for my master, that you may be able to show that of my said master without this, so that they may not think that you have told me anything about it. . . . I should have written to you in cypher, but my secretary has told me that it was not necessary, and that he was writing to you in cypher. I write also to my natural brother (*frère bastard*), according to the advice of my uncle, M. de Guise. The said letters are open, in order that you may deliver them if you approve of them.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 6.

What a maze for a poor child's head of secrets and mysteries, and with what satisfaction our queen throws herself into these arcana. We have no doubt she could at this time quite command both speech and countenance, so that no one about her should guess she knew what she did not choose to be supposed acquainted with. This is all very ingenious and clever in a child, but we do think may fairly make us mistrust the intrinsic sincerity of the 'frank artless manner,' and the 'open and unsuspicious temper' her panegyrists so constantly extol in her, and by which they will always interpret the hard facts of the case which give so contrary an impression. But our readers may think us harsh in deducing such consequences from a little girl's dutiful letter to her mamma. It is solely to show her an apt pupil in a bad system. This same bad system must also share the greater part of the blame in a subsequent act of atrocious duplicity, in the well known matter of the secret bonds she was induced to put her hand to when she reached the age of fifteen. Previous to her marriage with the Dauphin, and before the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, who were to bring the articles of agreement from the Scotch parliament, Henry and her uncles, the Guises, got her to sign three secret bonds. The first of these acts (Mignet, vol. i. p. 46) was a full and free donation of Scotland to the Kings of France, in case of her dying without heirs, in consideration of the services which those monarchs had at all times rendered to Scotland by defending her from England, *her ancient and inveterate enemies,* and especially for the assistance which she had received from Henry II., who had maintained her independence at his own expense during her minority; the second act made over all the revenues of Scotland to France till a certain impossible sum, alleged to be due but not acknowledged by Scotland, should be paid; and the third confirmed these preceding documents, *whatever public articles of agreement she might be induced to sign.* After stating that for certain

reasons she has no means of opposing openly measures in Scotland which she disapproves, the protestation goes on:—

'For this reason she has protested, and protests, that whatever agreement or consent she has made, or may make, to the articles and instructions sent by the estate of her kingdom, in case she dies without heirs, she wishes and intends that the dispositions made by her in that case for and to the profit of the Kings of France, remain entire, and have their full and entire effect in spite of the agreements and consents that she makes, or will make, hereafter, if any she makes, on these articles and instructions, or otherwise, as things that will be made directly against her will, desire, and intention.' —*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 55; *Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 70.

These three documents she signed voluntarily; and fifteen days after, with equal willingness, she signed publicly before the Scotch commissioners acts and agreements of a directly contrary import, securing the integrity of Scotland, its independence of France, and appointing an heir chosen by them in case of her dying without issue. The sin of this iniquitous transaction lies so heavily on the French court, that, by comparison, Mary, a child of fifteen, may be hardly said to bear the guilt of it; but it at least illustrates what her education had been, and what principles and practices she was already made familiar with.

It is quite in conformity with the tone of her education, that Mary should send a letter to her mother by these same commissioners, full of smooth, graceful satisfaction with everything and everybody, the king, the queen, her young husband, her relations and friends, and also with the favours that had been bestowed on these same duped commissioners, who 'had been so well received and gratified in every possible way;' (*de tout ce qu'il a esté possible.*)

Mary is justly termed unfortunate, though not, as we have said, from the circumstances which are understood to obtain for her this affecting epithet; her misfortune seems really to lie in the fitness and congeniality of the position in which she was now placed with the leading features of her character. There was in herself nothing counter to the training she received—no resolute independent sense of right and wrong to resist this false teaching. Things around her were all smooth, easy, and delightful, and she seems to have acquiesced without a doubt in the fact, that this was the way kings reigned, and nations were ruled. She at once acquired high ideas of the rights of sovereignty, especially of its superiority to, and independence of, every earthly tribunal; and low ones of the responsibilities of this exalted station, and of the duties which it imposes. Her sojourn in France deprived her of all feelings of nationality, so that she regarded her own country only as a dependency on

Digitized by Google

her adopted kingdom, important to her as the source of her own power and greatness, but mere banishment and expatriation as her home. It is hardly a censure to say that Mary wanted patriotism, so removed was she from everything to excite this virtue; but still, on this point we find a great contrast between her and her rival (to adopt the received phraseology) Elizabeth. We do not believe, that, had Elizabeth, even at the same early age, been exposed to the same temptation, she could have been induced by any power, or for the sake of any personal advantage, so to sign away her people and her country by a stroke of her pen. But the deep duplicity in which Mary was bred made nothing seem true or real. No promise was binding, nothing was what it seemed to be; and, consequently, the only objects worth striving for were pleasure and personal aggrandisement, and the only intellectual endowments to be cultivated were such as furthered these ends,—external graces and accomplishments, and a certain subtle penetration, as far removed from the qualities of a sound judgment, as cunning is from wisdom. What real good Henry and the Guises could have proposed to themselves by this sacrifice of the young queen's integrity, it is difficult to make out; any honest man would have seen it was a measure as impossible to carry out as it was unjust in conception, but it was only too much in conformity with the treacherous policy of those times. Beyond its moral influence on those concerned, and as illustrating the principles on which Mary's character was formed, it did, in fact, produce no fruit,—it came to nothing. The next step taken by her under their advice had more definite consequences, though in itself less reprehensible. It was the first of the many 'fatal' measures which mark her reign; fatal, as filling her own mind with pretensions she could never realize, and never abandon; and fatal, as bringing upon her the permanent jealousy and mistrust of that great queen, whose genius always ruled over Mary's. For if we will amuse ourselves with ideas of fatality, apart from the inevitable consequences of men's actions, to Mary might well have been addressed the soothsayer's warning words:—

> 'Thy dæmon, that's the spirit which keeps thee, is
> Noble, courageous, high, unmatchable,
> Where *hers* is not; but, near *her*, thy angel
> Becomes a Fear, as being o'erpower'd; therefore
> Make space enough between you.'

It was an evil hour for Mary, when, insulting Elizabeth's honour and daring her vengeance, she called herself Queen of England;—an empty claim, as we regard it now, for Elizabeth

Digitized by Google

knew so firmly how to keep her own, that we cannot understand what a strong grasp it needed; but no empty claim to either queen, never forgotten by her who was injured by it, nor in her inner intention once renounced by Mary. And it should be kept equally in mind by the student of those times, that, on Mary Tudor's death, Mary of Scotland did assert herself her heir to the English throne by virtue of the bull which declared Elizabeth illegitimate. For here we find a key to much of that 'malignity,' 'vindictiveness,' 'envy,' and 'jealousy,' which is ascribed to Elizabeth in all her dealings with Mary; sometimes most unjustly ascribed,—for often Elizabeth acted like the truest friend to her rival, and did what her best friends did, or ought to have done,—but on other occasions, with too much colour of truth. The jealousy that Elizabeth felt against Mary was not, we believe, that weak, personal sentiment, which it is assumed to be. It was not a vain woman's jealousy of another's superior attractions, but it was a queen's jealousy of a powerful rival, who had gifts and talents to assert her claims, and followers to maintain them. Elizabeth, great woman as she was, had yet too high an opinion of her own right to general admiration, and too many flatterers to feed these notions, to have much room for jealousy. All Mary's lovers had been rejected by herself; she was the object of universal homage and unbounded adulation; and, perhaps, none of all the judgments of posterity regarding herself would have surprised her more than its unanimous award of the palm of beauty and grace to her sister queen.

Our author, though full of prejudice against Elizabeth, is yet alive to her great qualities. It is thus that he introduces her to his readers. We omit a long and well-known extract, which occurs in the middle of the passage, from the account of her person and manner left by the Venetian ambassador:—

'What was the character of this princess, whose hostility the court of France did not fear to excite against Mary Stuart, who, from that moment, became her rival, both as a queen and a woman? High-spirited, imperious, extremely proud, with great energy, astuteness, and capacity, Elizabeth had long been compelled to dissimulate her feelings and her religious faith during the terrible reign of her sister, who would have proscribed her but for the support given her by Philip II. She had lived at a distance from the Court under strict surveillance, and had thus acquired those habits of deception which combined in her with the haughty and violent passions she inherited from her father. . . . . To the most solid learning Elizabeth united the most agreeable accomplishments. She was an excellent musician, and danced to perfection. Certain gifts of person, great mental attractions, all the adornments of a brilliant education, much originality without sufficient grace, and the resources of a strong and lively imagination, rendered her remarkable as a woman; whilst her acute and

Digitized by Google

penetrating judgment, her unwearied application, her haughty and politic disposition, and her active ambition, destined her to be a great Queen.

'On the day of her accession she displayed those qualities which characterised all the rest of her life. She took possession of the throne as a matter of course, and passed from oppression to command without either surprise or uneasiness. Adopting the policy which was destined to constitute the glory of her reign, she pursued it assiduously, but without precipitancy. We cannot say she was a zealous Protestant, but she was averse to Catholicism, as the religion which had oppressed her youth, and still menaced her crown. She felt more disposed to detest than to contest it. She said that she had read neither Luther nor Calvin, but S. Jerome and S. Augustine, and she considered that the points of difference between the various Christian communities were of very little importance. She therefore restored Protestantism rather from policy than conviction, in order to give the direction of affairs, and the government of the state, to her own party, and withdraw it from her adversaries.

'She immediately surrounded herself with men of great ability or entire devotion to her service. Her two principal advisers were Lord Robert Dudley, one of the sons of the Duke of Northumberland, whom she appointed her Master of the Horse, and who remained her favourite as long as he lived; and William Cecil, whom she made Secretary of State, and who was her prime minister for forty years. Careful to retain those whom she had chosen, she was always well served. She never permitted her favourites to become for a single moment her masters, and her most experienced ministers were never more than her useful instruments. On all occasions, though she sought counsel, she acted upon her own decisions. Her will, guided solely by either calculation or interest, was sometimes slow, often audacious, always sovereign. In less than a month after she had succeeded Mary Tudor, the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip II:—"She is held in incomparably greater dread than her sister. She orders and does whatever she pleases, just as absolutely as the king her father." Speaking of herself, with a full consciousness of what she was and what she could effect, Elizabeth said about this time, "that she would let the world know that there was in England a woman who acted like a man, and who was awed neither by a Constable of Montmorency like the King of France, nor by a Bishop of Arras like the King of Spain.'"—*Mignet*, vol. i. pp. 51—55.

Such was the woman whom Mary so rashly provoked. We do not esteem M. Mignet a judge of how far Elizabeth was influenced by religious feeling. He probably does not understand the position of the English Church, and its middle course between two extremes, which Elizabeth in her arbitrary way helped to establish. But there is truth, though unfriendly truth, in the rest. Elizabeth had duplicity. It was the art and study of the times, and she was an adept in it, as far as gaining her ends proves it.

But the practice of duplicity being universal, we must learn to discriminate between different kinds. That for which the Court of France of the period is so infamously distinguished was *aggressive* in its character, and so far unprovoked. It used it as a weapon of offence, as an assassin uses a dagger. Elizabeth's dissimulation was first assumed to protect her very life, which one rash word would have sacrificed; and in a general

Digitized by Google

review of her subsequent conduct we still see the same principle of self-defence—defence of herself and of her kingdom—in her practice of it. Mary began by claiming the throne of England, and though afterwards circumstances obliged her apparently to withdraw it, we see now, and doubtless Elizabeth knew then, that at any favourable moment the claim would be renewed. To guard against this favourable moment ever dawning, was henceforth one of the main objects of her policy, sometimes by very crooked means it must be granted, but it was adopted towards Mary to secure her own position rather than to encroach on that of others. If Mary had let her alone, and if her attitude from inevitable circumstances had been less threatening, Elizabeth, as much from inclination as good sense, would have maintained a sincere good understanding with her.

But between Mary and Elizabeth there was a still further difference in the character of the duplicity each practised; the one is politic, and bound up with politics and state craft, the other selfish and personal. Mary's crying sins of this nature were against the interests and feelings of her country, for private motives and the indulgence of personal ends; though she too, under French influence, could adopt their large aggressive plans of deception. Elizabeth's motives were national and patriotic. Perhaps circumstances may have aided this happy unison of interests, but as a fact, no private feeling ever led her to forget the welfare of her people; all her personal wishes for greatness and prosperity were bound up in theirs; in this sense she may be said to have had no private ends. When she sinned against honesty and truth, it was under a false notion that she was promoting her people's advantage as much as her own. Her private feelings and fancies were ever subservient to the public cause. She was often arbitrary and tyrannical, but she never forgot that the course she pursued required of her great personal sacrifices, and she knew she had no right to enact the absolute queen and the self-indulgent woman at the same time. Pleasure and the gratification of natural desires were always made to yield to greatness. She showed her people that if she ruled them with a strong hand she could control herself as sternly. Even her follies and vanities she contrived to make useful. 'The artificial politics of Elizabeth,' (says Hume,) 'never triumphed so much in any contrivances as in those which 'were conjoined with her coquetry;' and she was not ridiculous without rather helping on the cause in hand than obstructing it.

Mary, on the contrary,—and it is the secret of her influence,—was a woman in the full meaning of the word. First a woman, and then a queen. She could not give up her inclinations to her position. She could *act* the queen to perfection, but she

Digitized by Google

was unequal to the constant sacrifice, the long self-control needed by those who wield sovereign power. Like the Egyptian queen, whom she in some points resembles, she was

> 'E'en a woman, and commanded
> By such poor passions as the maid that milks,
> And does the meanest chars.'

And on this unqueenlike nature were engrafted perfect grace and beauty, constituting her queen of hearts, perhaps, but not queen of her people. At twenty-five Elizabeth felt herself the mother of her people; Mary through her whole life shows no touch of this maternal instinct. Her interests, her plots, her wishes, were all personal and private ones. Patriotism, such as it was, was to be found amongst her opponents—Murray and even Knox are examples of it; but Mary had apparently no conception of this sentiment. Her cause, and it was sometimes as much her misfortune as her fault, never at the best included more than a very small minority.

Both training and nature conspired to make these women opposites. Elizabeth's youth had been one of fear, and caution, and restraints, and her deportment always bore traces of this hard discipline in its stiffness and want of grace. Mary's had been tenderly fostered; she was admired, and even beloved, as far as the denizens of that court had hearts to love. Her 'charming nature' could expand in all the sunshine of general approval—there were no cold checks shutting her up within herself: her manner was therefore open, frank, engaging, and cordial—how should a prosperous joyous beauty's ever be otherwise? but it was only an accomplishment, formed not by the heart so much as by external circumstances. She had no need in her youth for habitual circumspection, and her general demeanour was the gainer by it. But her biographers claim much larger admissions, and expect us to believe in it against positive fact, as if amiable manners were incompatible with great crimes, and the deception which belongs to them; as if Elizabeth must be the dissembler, and Mary the generous victim of impulse, because the one betrays an awkward consciousness of a discreditable secret, the other shows an open smiling face through all, and can keep up two distinct currents of thought, the one represented by the unruffled *viso sciolto*, the other far down in the depths, away from sight and thought, and only stirred when the moment of action arrives. It only shows she was the more accomplished dissembler of the two, according to all the rules of art. All this was understood in their own day, and the general judgment of that time accords with our own. Elizabeth was beloved by her people because she loved them; because she acted for them, they reverenced and feared

Digitized by Google

her, but still more did they love her: they identified their safety with her own, and unfortunately the conscience of that period was not easily shocked by ordinary duplicity, where they themselves were the gainers. But Mary was neither feared nor loved nor respected by her people. The misfortune of religious differences might in part cause this; her path craved wary walking: but they never saw her acting for them as a whole; when she was most queenlike and most public spirited it was yet for herself. She could win over partisans, but she never gained her people to her side: when she plotted, it was against them, and not for them, and where treachery was an every day vice, she yet by one act succeeded in raising a storm of genuine sincere abhorrence, which amongst the *people* of her own land was never allayed.

Thus gifted, with such pretensions; ambitious, energetic, loving pleasure and excitement, and unscrupulous in the modes of obtaining them; with an ardent cultivated imagination and a cold heart; with impulses sometimes generous, but with a consistent indifference to truth; with a zeal for religion, but no submission to its precepts,—Mary, after her long minority and upon her early widowhood, eluding the English fleet which Elizabeth, in her indignation at the recent insult, had sent to impede her course, returned to her kingdom,—unwillingly returned: nor can we wonder, for never did a prince enter upon his reign under more difficult circumstances, never was country less fitted to obey and submit itself to female rule. She returned to Scotland, then a seething hot-bed of dissensions, where social misrule and centuries of civil war had undermined all ideas of law and justice, and disorganized the whole framework of society; where the nobility had neither loyalty, nor patriotism, nor honour towards one another, but all were for self, and personal or family aggrandisement; where the people were reduced to extremity and desperation by the alternate oppressions of contending factions: while, to add to these long-standing evils, this country seemed to be chosen for the arena in which the old and new principles of religious faith should fight out their differences with the least restraint from the hand of power,—or rather, with so equal a balance of physical strength to assist the intrinsic merits of the question, as made the conflict more a religious, as opposed to a political one, than in any country in Europe. While Hume tells us that the English were so passive with regard to religious changes that throughout the Tudor dynasty they altered their faith with each reign more willingly than the order of succession, the populace of Scotland were ardent theologians. Weary with oppressions, disgusted by the monstrous immoralities of the churchmen in power, and ripe for change, the principles of a

Digitized by Google

change in religion spread like wildfire or like light through the land, bringing (to their minds) not only hope of spiritual illumination, but anticipations of freedom, power, learning, cultivation, whatever is most enchanting to the hopes of an awakened people, in their train; and history seems to show that while the preachers of the Reformation brought zeal and sincerity,—tarnished, it is true, by a fierce intolerance,—to the conflict, their antagonists, too like that wicked steward taken at unawares, eating and drinking with the drunken, had little to oppose to the new truths brought to light, and the errors sometimes deduced from them, but an unreasoning bigotry and a vain endeavour to quench the whole movement by persecution.

It was a lasting misfortune to Scotland that there was then no one of power and genius and zeal to stand up for the old truths, which in the flood of new light were too likely to be forgotten, and thus that the mind of one man was left to organize the religion of his country. The hand which pulls down is not commonly fitted for reconstruction; and Knox, remorseless in his destruction of what he called idolatries, has left his religious edifice bare, not only of all graceful ornament, but of its most needful supports and defences.

Mary had conceived a great hatred of Knox, yet it seems clear that, trusting to her powers of fascination, she hoped much from her personal influence. He was too powerful to be put down by the strong arm, which would have been the natural and readiest method; but what effect might not her charms produce in softening the force of his fierce attacks upon her Church and its professors, or even winning him to her side! But Knox was the only man of her day whom Mary could not influence; who was blind to her fair face, deaf to her eloquent and pathetic words, callous even to her tears—never shed by Mary but as a last resource. Very early he seems to have settled Jezebel as her appropriate type, and Jezebel she always was to him so long as he lived to call her so. It would be more fair to charge Knox with brutality towards his queen, had his sombre prophecies and suspicions not been too fully verified by subsequent events. But it is impossible to read his interviews with her without being scandalized at the audacious freedom of his address, and without partaking too in Hume's cynical amusement at the scene they presented. 'This rustic apostle,' as he calls him, 'though he once condescended so far as to tell the queen 'that he would submit to her as Paul did to Nero, remained not 'long in this dutiful strain.' Poor Mary might well be bewildered at such a mode of address. The French court had furnished her with no parallel examples. But though she was at first dismayed at the wild rudeness of manners in her new

Digitized by Google

kingdom, it does not seem that she was permanently dispirited by the change from all the elegance she had been accustomed to. Youth, health, love of adventure, and greater freedom of action, seem soon to have reconciled her to a country which appeared simply barbarous to her at first; and though rude and uncouth, her people were not insensible to those charms which had left so deep an impression in the country she had quitted. On one of her first public appearances Tytler thus describes her court, and the impression she herself produced:—

'The parliament which met was held with unusual pomp. Mary, surrounded by a brilliant cavalcade, rode in procession to the Tolbooth, where the Estates assembled: the hall was crowded, not only by the members, but glittered with the splendid dresses of the ladies of the court, who surrounded the throne and filled the galleries. The extreme beauty of the queen, and the grace with which she delivered the address in which she opened the proceedings, surprised and delighted her people. Many exclaimed, "May God save that sweet face! She speaks as properly as the best orator among them."'—*Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 280.

Nor did the austere morality of the Reforming party, and their hatred of every class of amusements, withhold her from indulgence in them to an extent dangerous at least to her character for prudence and royal dignity. So extreme was the popular animosity against the ceremonies and the professors of the old religion, and so ignorant of the principles of charity and toleration were their teachers, that even had Mary observed an austerity of manners equal to their own, so long as she had been zealous and devoted in the practice of her faith, it would have needed policy as well as prudence to maintain her position. She might even have been in the end a martyr to her fidelity. She *might* have been—but her panegyrists and Roman Catholic historians say that she *was*, and she herself died under the same persuasion—and it is this which we deny, and which the whole course of her life disproves. That cause must be ill off for bright examples—must be driven to strange shifts in its defence—that raises Mary, under the most favourable view that ingenious special pleading can take of her character, into a martyr for any good cause. The old faith of Scotland had no doubt its true martyrs, but they were not to be found amongst its leading supporters. Mary was one of the many on whom mistrust and suspicion produce recklessness rather than caution, and she was soon brought under the censures, not only of 'sour fanatics,' but of prudent men of the world, for the bold departures from dignity and queenly decorum to which her love of admiration and passion for every form of diversion led her. Angry and jealous eyes did watch her, to note down that she who maintained 'the idolatry of the mass' in her chapel, against all their remonstrances, and refused to profit by the godly exhortations of their ministers, was, as they esteemed it, consistent in her

derelictions, in bringing upon herself such indignities as led to the death of her mad lover, Chastelard. But though they might complain of her personal obstinacy in maintaining the faith in which she had been born and bred, in spite of their not very persuasive efforts for her conversion, the Reformers had really very little justice on their side so long as Murray was in power to act out Mary's professions of universal toleration—professions which she was always ready to make so long as there was nothing better to be done. Her government under his administration was really a wise and beneficent one, nor is there any stronger cause of quarrel with those times and their monstrous practices, their crying evils, and the equally desperate remedies which were then tolerated, than that they should bring so great a man as Murray under just suspicion of sometimes sharing, or at least conniving at them. A true patriot, where all besides were for themselves—just, where justice was almost forgotten, and wise in a large sense, where private ends and petty schemes had obscured the general judgment, we are sometimes at a loss to understand how a man of such undoubted qualities should ever be brought into the questionable positions in which we see him.

It was an evil day for Mary, when in opposition to his earnest remonstrances she chose Darnley for her husband, and thus turned her best adviser into something very like a rebel, in attitude at least, if not in intention. But in the first place, Mary liked the 'long boy,' as Elizabeth called him; next, it did seem as though, if she waited till all who had a right to a voice were of one mind, especially till Elizabeth (with whom Murray was commonly agreed) was satisfied with her choice of a husband, she should probably never be married at all; in the third place, Darnley, as being her cousin, and also connected through the mother's side with the house of Tudor, might help on her open claim to be acknowledged successor to Elizabeth, and the secret one, (which in her own mind always went along with it,) her present right to the English throne; lastly, he was a Roman Catholic, and Mary was urged by her foreign allies, and was also herself inclined, in spite of her professed policy of conciliation, to make a push for the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion by mere force. Nothing, we think, can better show that the defence of Mary involves a general depreciation and blackening of character towards all concerned with her, than the line Mr. Fraser Tytler takes on this point towards Murray. We will quote his words.

Murray gave, as the ground of his opposition to the marriage, that the Protestant religion was endangered by it; upon which Mr. Fraser Tytler says—

'Nothing upon the part of Murray could be more futile and unfounded than the pretence that the Protestant religion was in danger, or that the

queen at this moment had adopted any measures which threatened its security. It is happy for the truth, that on such a point we have the declaration of Murray and Lethington themselves. On the thirteenth of July, 1564, they stated to Cecil that the presence of Lenox in Scotland, even if he should be fortunate enough to ally himself with the most powerful person in the state, would be totally ineffectual to shake the national religion from that firm foundation on which it rested. These declarations were made, indeed, a year before this, but during the course of that year, not only had the Scottish queen introduced no one measure which could by any ingenuity be deemed an attack upon the national religion, but she had shown the most decided determination to support it as the religion of the state, and to enforce the cruel and unjust laws against those who adhered to the public exercise of a contrary faith. It is evident, therefore, that the Earl of Murray and the party of the nobles who opposed the marriage had raised the cry of "danger to the Church" merely to cover their own designs.'—*Tytler*, vol. vi. p. 345.

Now a *year* at such a period may lead wise men to change their opinion. Murray spoke when he was in power, and could therefore answer for the conduct of matters according to his wishes; he raised his objection when his own influence was at an end, when Rizzio, acknowledged to be in the Pope's pay, whom his penetration would mistrust, though he might not then know all that we do of his secret workings for Rome, was rising in power. Nor would Mary's professed zeal to carry out the 'unjust laws' against her own religion be likely to deceive such a man into a belief of her sincerity; rather it might well produce a different effect. Though this was one of the very acts which afterwards succeeded under Charles IX. in lulling the suspicions of the Huguenots, the wiser Murray may have seen in these professions only an attempt to reconcile her Protestant subjects to the marriage she had at heart.

But what are the real facts of the case at this period, or at a time very little removed from it, when Mr. Tytler so boldly asserts that all fears were futile? It is true that in July 1565 she writes to a Scottish Laird in the Scotch of that period:—

'*July* 16, 1565.

'Trusty friend, we greet you well. The evil bruit and untrue report spread by seditious persons among our lieges has grieved us indeed, as that we should have intended to impede or molest any of our subjects in the use of their religion and conscience freely. A thing which never entered in our mind, although over many has credited the report; and to the effect that this vain bruit may evanish as a thing without ground or occasion, we have directed our letters to signify our sincere meaning to all our good subjects,' &c.—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 275.

But her earlier private letters to her uncle and the Pope are in a very different strain; not blamable in themselves, but showing another spirit altogether. The fact, however, which shows us Mary's real feeling, through all this profession of toleration, is, that the very first use she made of her power, within a very few months of the date of this letter, the first time that she felt

Digitized by Google

free to act, on subduing with so much spirit and success the rebellion that arose on her marriage with Darnley, was to sign the Band, as it is called, or League of Bayonne. It was under no sense of fear, but rather in the indulgence of revenge and in the triumph of success, when she for the first time felt emancipated from the restraints that had held her, that she signed what is thus described by Mr. Tytler himself. We give Mary the benefit of his opening apologies for her:—

'Had Mary been left to herself, there is little doubt that the rebels would have been pardoned. Her natural generosity, and the intercession of some powerful friends, strongly impelled her to the side of mercy, and she had already consented to delay the parliament and to entertain proposals for the restoration of the banished lords, when an unforeseen circumstance occurred which led to unfortunate results. This was the arrival of two gentlemen, De Rambouillet and Clernau, on a mission from the French Court. Their message was outwardly one of mere ceremony, to invest the young king with the order of S. Michael; but, amid the festivities attendant on the installation, a more important and secret communication took place. Clernau, the special envoy of the Cardinal Lorraine, and Thornton, a messenger from Beaton, the Scottish ambassador in France, who had come to Court about the same time, informed Mary of the coalition which had been concluded between France, Spain, and the Emperor, for the destruction of the Protestant cause in Europe. It was a design worthy of the dark and unscrupulous politicians by whom it had been planned, Catherine of Medicis and the Duke of Alva. In the summer of the preceding year, the Queen Dowager of France and Alva had met at Bayonne during a progress in which she conducted her youthful son and sovereign Charles IX. through the southern provinces of his kingdom; and there, whilst the Court was dissolved in pleasure, those secret conferences were held which issued in the resolution that toleration must be at an end, and that the only safety for the Roman Catholic faith was the extermination of its enemies.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 15.

Rizzio, the paid emissary of Rome, now all-powerful in Mary's counsels, urged her assent, and in spite of the dissuasions of some, she signed the League, and at the same time determined to carry matters to extremities against her rebel subjects: and here Tytler and Mignet, both favourers of Mary, take different lines; for while the first says, 'Her *intention* of pardoning Murray and her other rebels was opposed by these foreign envoys;' and again, 'Mary was not naturally inclined to harsh and cruel measures, and for some time she vacillated;' Mignet says, 'But Mary was too passionate to be politic; she preferred to 'pursue her schemes of vengeance, and far from listening to 'Melvil's representations that persons should not be urged to 'extremity lest they became dangerous; she angrily told him '"I do not fear them. What would they dare, or what could 'they undertake?"' (Vol. i. p. 200.)

'She imagined herself,' [says Mr. Tytler,] 'a supporter of the Catholic Church, when she was giving her sanction to one of the worst corruptions 'Romanism:'

Digitized by Google

an apology which may be made with equal justice for all the actors in this affair. Mary had private revenge to gratify, and was actuated by this motive to precisely the same degree as the rest were. Previous to this event Mary had addressed an autograph letter to Philip of Spain, asking his assistance, beginning:—

'*Sept.* 10, 1565.

'Monsieur, my good Brother,—The affection with which you have always employed yourself for the maintenance and support of our Catholic religion has made me before seek your favour and aid, foreseeing what now has happened in this kingdom, which tends to the entire ruin of the Catholics, and to the establishment of those unhappy errors, the which wishing to resist, the King my husband and myself will be in danger of losing our crown, and by the same means the *right which we claim elsewhere*, (*le droit que pretendons aylleurs*,) if we have not the aid of one of the great princes of Christendom.'—*Labanoff*, vol. i. p. 281.

The King of Spain sent twenty thousand crowns in answer to this appeal, and wrote for her to the Pope, who sent her eight thousand. Any other succour it was not convenient for him to give, though he adds that they must not renounce the idea of asserting by armed force the Queen of Scotland's right to the succession of England. 'This project,' he said, 'concerns the cause of God which is mentioned by the Queen of 'Scotland, since it is evidently the only door by which religion 'can enter into the kingdom of England, for all others are now 'shut.' (*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 192.)

Subsequent to her signing of the League she summoned a parliament for the condemnation of Murray and others; on which M. Mignet says:—

'A short time before the meeting of this assembly, which she destined to further her revenge, and was desirous to associate in her plans in favour of the ancient Church, she sent the Bishop of Dumblane to assure the new Pope, Pius V., of her devoted obedience. She besought him to grant her both temporal and spiritual assistance, "in order to change," she wrote, "the deplorable and unfortunate state of our kingdom. The moment is propitious, because our enemies are partly banished, and partly placed within our hands .... If God and your Holiness, whose cause we maintain, come to our aid, with such assistance we shall overcome all obstacles." '—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 200.

After this we leave it to our readers to decide whether the alleged reasons for Murray's alarm and opposition to her marriage and its consequent change of counsels were so 'futile' and groundless. In the meanwhile, Mary enjoyed the life which these disturbances brought her into. At the beginning of the campaign,—on horseback, with pistols at her saddle-bow,—she put herself at the head of her army, and carried all before her, declaring she would rather peril her crown than lose her revenge; she wished to be a man, that she might know what it was to lie

Digitized by Google

out on the field all night and to walk the rounds; and on one occasion some noblemen of her retinue having represented to her that she would fatigue herself by so much riding, and by following the army in inclement weather, she replied, on the report of Paul de Foix, the French ambassador, 'that she would 'never cease to continue such fatigues until she had led them 'to London;' a threat probably not heard by Randolph, the English envoy, who accompanied her in the expedition, and, quite inspired by this restoration of the days of chivalry, thus wrote to Cecil: 'What desperate blows would that day have been 'given, when every man should have fought in sight of so noble 'a queen and so many fine ladies,—our enemies, to have taken 'them (our honours) from us, and we, to save our honours, and 'not to be bereft of them,—your honour may easily imagine.'

But the scene soon changed from this triumphant success. Events succeed one another rapidly in this part of Mary's history, and every turn of the page brings us upon something new and strange. Shakspeare might well talk of the whirligig of time in his day, for nowhere in man's history do we find such instances of its revenges; nowhere do the actors in the busy scene so rapidly change and reverse their positions towards one another. Faithful subjects become traitors, and are back again to their allegiance, and in favour, before we know how it can have been effected. We cannot tell who are plotters and who are confidential friends; who are faithful, who designing; for all are each by turn. Elizabeth's lovers make no scruple of planning her death; she in her turn is now an ally, now an enemy; no one knows where to have her. Mary is now pursuing her rebel brother to the death, then weeping tears of reconciliation in his arms; at one moment she is on the pinnacle of power, with all her enemies banished, or at her feet; and then, by some sudden turn, for which it is hard to find an adequate cause,—by the death of one man, and he an insignificant adventurer,—the tables are turned; she is the prisoner, and her enemies coolly concert what is to be done with her.

We need not go into the familiar details of her change of feeling towards her young husband; the wild excitement and freedom from restraint which would follow upon a warlike campaign, and the greater liberty of action which her success would prompt her to, might make the ordinary routine of decorous female life insupportable to Mary, and Darnley had nothing in him to counteract these ill influences. Blinded by a weak and childish pride, the consequence of Mary's unwise favours, he took no pains, after his marriage, to confirm his hold on her affections. She grew disgusted with and weary of him, and soon gave him cause for disgust in his turn, by the wilful intimacy

she indulged in with her low-born secretary, Rizzio. She was entirely guided by his counsels, which were well known to be all on the side of severity to the proscribed noblemen, and of active measures for the restoration of the old religion and the suppression of the new. As if all these causes did not sufficiently excite popular feeling against him, he assumed a great state and retinue, and was proud and intolerable in his deportment. Darnley, with good grounds, was jealous. The nobles were indignant at his political power. The people hated him for being a foreigner and a papist. Knox and his coadjutors regarded him as the representative of all the enemies of 'God's people,' (as they exclusively designated their followers and themselves,) from Oreb and Zeeb to Haman, and thought themselves divinely commissioned to sanction his destruction.

Rizzio's murder, with all its savage details, strangely illustrates the times. The public motives for which it was undertaken, and the sort of judicial character assumed by the murderers, seem to resolve it into an exercise of Lynch law, while the circumstances of brutal atrocity towards the queen rank it amongst the most savage deeds of blood of any age. Nor is Mary's courage and self-command amongst the least remarkable features in the affair. She never lost her powers of thought and action, nor was she as overwhelmed by it as the most courageous woman would now be. It was something more within possibility, more conceivable, more a part of the general experience of the age. All persons were inured to the thought of blood; and here, if anywhere, here only lies the excuse for that great deed of blood in which Mary herself so soon after engaged,—that the practices of murder and assassination were too common in Scotland for them to be held in quite the same awe and horror, or so utterly abhorrent to our nature as the law of our being holds them to be in peaceable times. We do not say it *is* an excuse; but with the weight of evidence we have, it would be more reasonable for Mary's apologists to make it one, than to attempt to clear her from the guilt altogether, as some have attempted to do.

And here we may see how Mary was prepared for the part she so soon acted. First, in the deep hatred with which Darnley's share in the murder inspired her towards him, expressed in the natural threat of the moment, 'Well, it shall be dear blood to some of you;' and chiefly in her power over herself at the same time to conceal this hatred, and actually, while her heart was yet sore with the death of her favourite, the scene of passionate recrimination with her husband, and the humiliating insults to herself, to dissimulate with him, to get up a reconciliation, to separate him from the conspirators, making him as contemptible to them as to herself by a public denial of his share

Digitized by Google

in the plot, and to make him assist her in her escape from the power of the conspirators. With extraordinary spirit and energy Mary escaped from their hands, and in a very short time was again in power, ruling paramount in Edinburgh, where she had so lately been a prisoner, avenging the death of Rizzio; and, to show her adherence to the course she had taken, appointing his brother secretary in his place. But all men saw that in her heart she hated Darnley, nor could she be persuaded, after the purpose of their apparent reconciliation was effected, to conceal her aversion. His life was miserable. She withdrew him from all share of public business, and forbade those about her to hold converse with him. 'He went up and down,' says Melvil, 'all alone, seeing few durst bear him company.' Her confidence was given to the Earls of Bothwell (who now first appears prominent in her history), Huntley, whose sister he had married, and the Catholic Bishop of Ross, who was so long her faithful adherent; but, says Mignet, 'Mary did not proceed to 'further extremes against Darnley, until her passion for another 'was added to her increased repugnance to himself.'

On the 19th of June, 1566, she gave birth to a son, which event was immediately communicated to Elizabeth, who on the moment of receiving the news, by a sudden pang of grief and envy, showed how much the course she had so firmly chosen for herself really cost her. She was giving a court ball; while she was dancing, Cecil went up to her, and whispered in her ear. Interrupting the dance, she sunk dejectedly into an arm-chair, and said to the ladies who surrounded her, 'that the Queen 'of Scots was mother of a fair son, while she was but a barren 'stock.'

The birth of this son revived the question of the succession, always so distasteful to Elizabeth. The English parliament thought it an occasion for expressing their anxious wish to have the question settled, though they were presently silenced by their queen, and Mary was not less eager on her side. But here, on entering upon the darkest page of Mary's history, we will quote from M. Mignet's straightforward narrative:—

'Notwithstanding Mary Stuart's ardent desire, the English succession remained in the same state as before. She still retained her claims, but had not succeeded in obtaining their recognition. She soon, however, compromised them, and, moreover, exposed herself to the loss of the crown of Scotland. After the birth of the prince royal, the misunderstanding increased between her husband and herself—a fatal passion at this time took possession of her heart. The object of this passion was the Earl of Bothwell, the most enterprising and dangerous man in Scotland. James Hepburn, fourth Earl of Bothwell, was then thirty years of age. He had succeeded his father in 1556, was possessed of large property, and held important offices in the kingdom. By his marriage with Lady Jane Gordon, he had become 'he brother-in-law of the Earl of Huntley, and had united one of the most

Digitized by Google

powerful families of the South with the most powerful family of the North. He was distinguished for great bravery, consummate audacity, boundless and unscrupulous ambition. Equally undisguised in his plans as in his vices, he aspired first to gain the affections of the Queen, and then to marry her. Although he was far from handsome, his martial bearing, his taste for pleasure, the undaunted resolution of his character, his air of chivalrous devotion, and the easy and elegant continental manners beneath which he concealed the wild and extravagant passions of his country, charmed the imagination of the Queen, and gave Bothwell great influence over her. Mary Stuart sought to render Bothwell a faithful and useful servant, but she speedily found in him a lover and a master.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 235.

Side by side with this description we will give his character by Mr. Fraser Tytler, remarkable for the ingenuity with which he turns Mary's toleration, not to say absolute indifference to his infamous morals, into a sort of merit, which is reflected, in some degree, back upon the man himself:—

'His ambition and audacity were unbounded. He was a man of notorious gallantry, and had spent a loose life on the Continent, from which, it was said, he had imported some of its worst vices. In attaining the objects of his ambition he was perfectly unscrupulous as to the means he employed, and he had generally about him a band of broken and desperate men, with whom his office of Border Warden made him familiar; hardened and murderous villains, who were ready on the moment to obey every command of their master. In one respect Bothwell was certainly better than many of his brother nobles. There seems to have been little craft or hypocrisy about him, and he made no attempt to conceal his infirmities or vices under the cloak of religion. It is not unlikely that, for this reason, Mary, who had experienced his fidelity to the crown, was more disposed to trust him in any difficulty than those stern and fanatical leaders who, with religion on their lips, were often equally indifferent as to the means they employed. It is certain that from this time she began to treat him with great favour, and to be guided by a preference so predominant that it was not unlikely to be mistaken for a more tender feeling.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 46.

Mr. Tytler never absolutely denies the reality of Mary's affection for Bothwell; he only tenderly delays the admission of it, his honesty as an historian compelling him to a detail of facts which can allow of no other construction. We have, throughout his story, little apologetic hints, preparatory to this disgraceful feature of Mary's character; such as—'It was Mary's weakness 'to be hurried away by the predominating influence of some one 'feeling and object.' 'It was the misfortune of her ardent dispo- 'sition that she was always under the domination of some strong 'and engrossing feeling, which sometimes led her to disregard 'appearances, and to believe she could never sacrifice enough to 'the object of her approval.' Only Miss Strickland ventures on the bold line of *entirely denying* that Mary ever cared for Bothwell at all—decidedly the best line, we should say, for a lady to take, who advocates the cause of this unfortunate queen—but a line so glaringly opposed to the facts of the case, to the universal consent of all that deserves to be called history, to every docu-

Digitized by Google

ment worthy of respect, and to the whole course of Mary's public and private conduct, as proves that feminine zeal for the honour of her sex has unfitted her, on this occasion at least, for the rigid and severer duties of the historian:—

'It is impossible' [she says] 'for any one who reads those details,' [Du Croc, the French ambassador, had described a quarrel between Mary and Bothwell after their marriage,] 'and remembers that they were written by a person who was behind the scenes, and related that which he had heard and seen, to believe for one moment that Bothwell was ever the object of Mary's love, or that her marriage with him originated from any other cause than dire necessity.'—*Miss Strickland's Letters of Queen of Scots*, vol. i. p. xxvii.

Du Croc's letter proves nothing of the kind, nor did he think anything of the kind, nor desire to convey this impression when he wrote it; on the contrary, he says, just after the said quarrel had happened, that the marriage is *already* repented of by Mary, which implies a *change* of feeling, and not that she had always been averse to it. This has been a digression, but it is amusing to see upon how slight a foundation a theory can be formed, against overwhelming opposing evidence, and also to what slender straws Mary's advocates have to trust in their defence.

Her contemporaries, at least, were not of this mind; all parties joined in observing this growing preference. Politicians wrote to one another, commenting on the increasing favour of the new favourite, which 'miscontenteth many;'—a circumstance which seems always to have acted as a sort of spur to Mary, who was stimulated by opposition;—and poor Darnley augured all sorts of evils from it to himself. He wrote secretly to the Pope, accusing the Queen of lukewarmness in religion (Bothwell being a Protestant), and feared for his life, which, with his ill conscience, and in the present aspect of affairs, was not unreasonable. He even meditated retiring to the Continent, but wanted resolution; indeed, he had always an affection for Mary, which the slightest kindness on her part could revive. But the time was not come for such experiments with his feelings. She preferred exposing his weakness, and bringing him into general contempt, and making all the world party to her private sentiments towards him. She did not care who should see the 'great grudges she entertained in her heart against him,' and always had entertained since Rizzio's murder. This event, which had so naturally disgusted her with her husband, had also been the means of bringing Bothwell forward, as his services had materially strengthened her position, and from that time he obtained unbounded influence over her. She heaped favours and offices upon him;[1] and upon occasion of his being wounded in some

[1] See Laing, vol. i. p. 13.

Digitized by Google

Border quarrels, betrayed such an amount of anxious alarm as seems to have raised general suspicion. Her visit to him on this occasion has been disputed, in every stage; its purposes, dates, results, are all canvassed and concluded upon, according to the view of the writer. It is the first great skirmish before the regular battle. M. Mignet has thus concluded upon it:—

'On the 6th of October, (1566,) the Queen sent hither the Earl of Bothwell with the title of Lord Lieutenant, to repress these disorders, and restore tranquillity. On the 8th she repaired in person to Jedburgh to hold her assizes, and to add the sanction of justice and armed force. On that same day Bothwell had with great bravery engaged in personal conflict with John Elliot, of Park, a notorious freebooter. In the scuffle Bothwell was severely wounded, and it was found necessary to convey him without loss of time to the neighbouring castle of Armitage. His illness furnished most conclusive proofs of Mary's attachment to him. "Understanding," says Crawford, "the certain report of this accident, the Queen was so highly grieved in heart that she took no repose of body till she saw him. The discharge of her judicial functions detained her at Jedburgh until the 15th of October, but no sooner was she at liberty, than she took horse and hastened to the castle where her favourite lieutenant was lying wounded. She was accompanied on her journey by Murray and some other nobles. Although Hermitage was eighteen miles distant from Jedburgh, she went and returned the same day.[1] She spent an hour with Bothwell, and notwithstanding the fatigues of the day, she sat up until late at night writing to him whom she had just left. The prostration of strength which ensued, and," adds Crawford, "the great distress of mind for the Earl of Bothwell, threw her the next day into a most dangerous illness. She fell into a swoon, and remained for some hours at the point of death. She was then seized with a violent fever, and continued insensible for several days. When she had somewhat recovered from this apparently desperate state, she thought her end was approaching, requested the nobles who were present to pray for her, confided her son to the guardianship of the Queen of England, and sent to inform her husband of her precarious condition. Bothwell, now convalescent, had hastened to her with other members of the privy council, and many of the most important nobles of the kingdom. Darnley did not arrive at Jedburgh until the 28th of October, two days after a favourable crisis had placed the Queen's life out of danger. Finding her so much recovered, he remained at Jedburgh only one night, and returned immediately to Glasgow.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 240.

From this time dates the history of the Darnley murder. Mary recovered slowly, and was overwhelmed with melancholy. On the 20th of November she arrived at Craigmillar, a castle about a league from Edinburgh, careworn and ready to sink under the contradictory feelings which agitated her. 'The Queen is not at 'all well,' writes the ambassador Du Croc to the Archbishop of Glasgow. 'I believe the principal part of her disease to consist 'of a deep grief and sorrow; nor does it seem possible to make her

[1] Laing says, 'The difficulties and haste of the journey are still preserved in the tradition of the country; that her white palfrey sank in a morass which retains the name of the Queen's Moss, and that she was accompanied only by ten attendants, who extricated her.'—Vol. i. p. 17.

Digitized by Google

'forget the same; still she repeats these words,—"I could wish 'to be dead."' And Lethington, who so soon devised a mode for releasing her from her troubles, says in a letter to the same person, 'It is a heart-break for her to think that he should be 'her husband; and how to be free of him she sees no outlet.' 'This knowledge of Mary Stuart's private feelings,' says Mignet, 'originated a number of fatal ideas in the minds of those that 'surrounded her;' and of the introduction of these fatal ideas, Mary herself has given an account in the Protestation she wrote and sent to the Earls of Huntley and Argyle, to sign at the Westminster Conference. Of course it was written to defend herself from guilt, but how far it exonerates her is another matter. The murderers of Rizzio—Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsey—were connected by ties of friendship and kindred with many members of the Privy Council. It occurred to these that there was one acceptable service by which they might procure for them the Queen's pardon. If they had been banished for one murder, they might be recalled to another. Lethington, clever and absolutely unscrupulous, first introduced the idea to her mind. This extraordinary conference is thus described by Mignet. Our readers must remember that the facts are taken from Mary's own admission; and it should be noted at the same time that Murray always denied the part attributed to him:—

'He communicated his plan to Bothwell, who joined in it with all the ardour of his headstrong ambition, and made it known to Argyle and Huntley. According to the statement of the Queen's friends he mentioned it also to Murray, who offered no objection to the scheme. After having concerted the matter among themselves, the new confederates repaired to Mary Stuart. Lethington addressed her in their name. He reminded the Queen of the great and intolerable injuries that she had received from her husband, laying much stress upon the ingratitude which he had displayed towards her, and upon the offences of which he was daily guilty. He then added, that if Her Majesty would be pleased to pardon the Earl of Morton, and the Lords Ruthven and Lindsey, they, in concert with the rest of the nobility, would find means to separate her from her husband by a divorce, so that she would no longer be involved in disagreement with him. This proposition caused her no surprise. She at first gave her consent, upon condition that the divorce should be legal, and should be no prejudice to the rights of her son. But a divorce was not so easily obtained, since it would be necessary to allege as the reason for it their near relationship, in reference to which the Pope had granted them a dispensation, or to bring Darnley to trial for adultery, or else to prosecute him on the charge of treason.

'These difficulties could not escape Mary's notice, and she knew that she would be exposed either to the delays of an uncertain negotiation, or to the scandal of a disgraceful trial. She accordingly affected scruples, and said that she would willingly retire into France, and leave Darnley in Scotland until he acknowledged his faults. But Lethington replied to her, that the nobles of her kingdom would not allow her to do so; and he even ventured,

Digitized by Google

in mysterious terms, to inform her of their dark designs. "Madam," he said, "soucy ye not, we are here of the principal of your Grace's nobility and counsel, that shall find the means well to make your Majesty quit of him without prejudice of your son; and albeit that my Lord of Murray here present be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your Grace is for a Papist, I am assured he will look through his fingers thereto, and will behold our doings and say nothing of the same." The Queen understood the full meaning of this insinuation, and replied that it was her pleasure nothing should be done by which any spot might be laid upon her honour, but she displayed no great indignation at the idea, and contented herself with saying, "Better permit the matter to remain in the state it is, abiding till God in his goodness put remedy thereto." Lethington took no heed of this slight opposition, and answered, "Madam, let us guide the business among us, and your Grace shall see nothing but good, and approved by Parliament." '—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 245.

The conversation from this extract is Mary's *own* recording, and *very shortly after it took place, the banished lords were recalled;* men whom she knew to be capable of any violence, and naturally anxious by any service to restore themselves to her favour. A month after this meeting, the baptism of the young prince took place with great pomp, on the 17th of December, at Stirling Castle. Elizabeth was godmother, (or gossip, as she calls it,) and presented a golden font for the occasion, the fate of which was to be presently after melted down to furnish money for carrying on the war. Mary conducted herself towards the assembled guests with infinite grace and amiability. Bothwell, though a Protestant, had the ordering of the Catholic service, and Darnley, solitary and sullen, remained under the same roof, but did not show himself nor take any part. The King was contemned in his own court; the father had no place at the baptism of his son. After the excitement which any occasion called out, Mary again sunk into despondency, and Du Croc writes, 'I can't pretend to foretel 'how all may turn, but I will say that matters cannot subsist 'long as they are, without being accompanied with sundry bad 'consequences.' How can we doubt, that at this period she was making up her mind to her share in the tragedy that so soon followed. Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsey, by what Mr. F. Tytler calls 'a judicious extension of mercy,' were pardoned, and returned, and, about the same time, (Dec. 23,) she restored the Archbishop of S. Andrew's consistorial jurisdiction, which had been suppressed since the Reformation, a measure to which subsequent events give a dark significancy.[1] Their pardon was declared early in January, an event which naturally filled Darnley with alarm. They were the men who had been once his accomplices, and he had denounced and deserted them. He at once left the Court, and went to his father, the Earl of Lennox, at Glasgow, where he fell ill. It at first looked like the effects of poison, but

[1] Laing, vol. i. p. 23.

Digitized by Google

presently proved to be small-pox. While he lay helpless, the plot against his life went on, Bothwell being the principal actor in it. He sought an interview with Morton immediately on his return, and pressed him to join the plot, assuring him that the Queen had given her consent. But Morton, grown wary by experience, refused without her hand writ for a warrant. On this, Bothwell returned to the Queen in the hope of persuading her to write what was required, but he failed; upon which Lethington sent a messenger with directions "to show to the Earl of Morton that the Queen[1] 'will hear no speech of that matter appointed to him:'" an oracular sentence, which is accepted by some as her indignant condemnation of the plot, with how much justice, connected with subsequent events, our readers can judge. But she would certainly, in any case, know better than to commit herself in so needlessly formal a manner. On the 20th of January, Mary writes to the Archbishop of Glasgow at Paris, detailing a conspiracy which she affects to have discovered of Darnley's attempt to gain the person of the young prince his son, and goes on as follows:—

'His behaviour and thankfulness to us is equally well known to God and the world, especially our own indifferent subjects see it, and in their hearts, we doubt not, condemn the same. Always we perceive him occupied and busy enough to have inquisition of our doings; which, God willing, shall always be such as none shall have occasion to be offended with them, or to report of us in any ways but honourably, however he, his father, and their fautors speak, which we know want no good will to make us have ado, if their power were equivalent to their minds. But God moderates their forces well enough, and takes the means of the execution of their pretences from them.—*Ibid.* p. 251.

This letter is written on the 20th of January. Next day she departed for Glasgow, accompanied as far as Callender by Bothwell and his brother-in-law, Huntley having engaged Bothwell's confidential servant, who goes by the name of French Paris, and whose subsequent confession is so remarkable, as her chamberlain. On Thursday, the 23d, she arrived at Glasgow. Darnley, having heard of her approach, was seized with an undefinable fear, and sent a gentleman to meet her,—'he was still infirm,' he said, 'and did not presume to come to her until he knew her wishes, and was assured of the removal of her displeasure.' To this Mary briefly replied, 'that there is no medicine against fear,' and, passing on towards Glasgow, came into Darnley's bedchamber. Here, though nothing had transpired to change her opinion since the previous Monday, she employed all her art to bring about a reconciliation, to reassure his mind, to remove his suspicions, and gain his confidence. 'At heart,' says Mignet, 'Darnley had always been strongly attached to her, and his un-

[1] Morton's Confession, Laing, vol. ii. p. 28.

Digitized by Google

'requited affection and wounded pride had been the causes of 'his withdrawal from Court.' He was ready now to confess his errors, and to promise everything that she required. He entreated her not to leave him again, and when she asked him to accompany her in a litter to Craigmillar, he gladly consented, on condition that the harmony of former times might be restored. We have a very full and minute account of this interview; strangely circumstantial, indeed; and from whose hand? From Mary's own, in a letter to Bothwell full of most graphic detail, most vividly given. Our readers all know the 'Silver Casket' and its contents. Yet we must pause in our narrative upon this first mention of it. How little did she think when, too excited by guilty love, guilty consciousness, and the weight of a wicked deed in the very act of its performance, to sleep, she traced those passionate, impure, most treacherous lines, that what was then done in secret, at dead of night, with injunctions for immediate destruction, should remain to bring damning evidence against her, to be treated of in Parliaments and read in Councils, to be translated, canvassed, word by word critically analysed, to stand for ever a witness against her which could not then, and cannot now be escaped from or evaded!—feebly denied, indeed, in her own day, and more confidently, as distance and time drew their veil over this perplexed and stormy period; but, as the science of historic investigation advances, only the more firmly established by every attempt to disprove their genuineness: till the only resource of those who *will* not believe that these letters were from Mary's hand, is indiscriminate, unsupported denial and assertion, which might as justly be applied, and would be as conclusive, against the most universally received fact in history. Our limits will not allow us to do more than assert our full conviction of their genuineness, as literal translations, that is, in English and Scotch, of Mary's original French, of which, perhaps, we should explain, nothing remains but the opening sentence which heads each letter. But for any who wish to pursue the question and judge for themselves, we would recommend the perusal of Laing's 'Dissertation on the Darnley Murder,' where all these letters and papers may be found, together with the confessions of the principal actors in the murder, and very clear, masterly conclusions upon them. One point of evidence, however, he does not dwell upon, being, we think, insensible to the literary merits, (they possess no other,) of these papers. They are full of nature and feeling, such as it is. We might almost say it is impossible that they should be forgeries, though people have not scrupled to attribute them to one plotter after another, as if any man of business in that period of epistolary stiffness and form-

Digitized by Google

ality, could assume at the moment a clever, excited, passionate woman's style; and was equal to the task of expressing the conflicting emotions of a mind in a course of sin, and on the verge of committing a great crime.

These papers consist first of eight letters to Bothwell, four of which were written previous to the murder,—two from Glasgow and two from Kirkfield,—and three from Stirling after the murder, which relate to the concerted scheme for her abduction by him previous to their marriage; and an eighth letter from Linlithgow immediately preceding that event; of two contracts of marriage between them—one supposed to be written before her husband's death, the other signed by her and Bothwell, but written by Huntley previous to Bothwell's divorce from his present wife; and a series of twelve sonnets addressed by Mary to Bothwell. Of these remarkable documents Laing observes:—

'The very disappearance of the originals demonstrates that they were genuine. During the administration of the four regents they were carefully preserved. From Murray they passed successively to Lennox and Morton, on whose execution they were conveyed secretly to Ruthven, created Earl of Gowrie, one of the confederates, from whom Elizabeth's solicitude to obtain the custody of the casket attests her conviction that the letters were authentic. It appears, however, that they were retained by Gowrie for the vindication of the confederates. As the young king was informed that they were then (1582) in his hands, as Mary was solicitous to get them delivered up or destroyed, and as the Duke of Lennox, his favourite, who was entirely in her interest, had applied to detain them, their disappearance on the attainder and execution of Gowrie (1584) must be ascribed to the desire of her son to suppress those documents of his mother's guilt, which, if spurious, would neither have been preserved by the four regents nor destroyed by James.'—*Laing*, vol. i. p. 332.

M. Mignet has no doubt whatever of the authenticity of the letters, and quotes largely from them. Some extracts from the 'Long letter' must be given in continuation of our narrative. It must have filled several sheets, taking up nine octavo pages of print. We must give the French opening by which it is known and the words of which must be so familiar to all controversialists on the subject.

'Estant party du lieu ou j'avois laissé mon cœur, il se peult aysement juger quelle estoit ma contenance, veu ce qui peult un corps sans cœur, qui a esté cause que jusque à la disnée je n'ay pas tenu grand propos, aussi personne ne s'est voulu advancer jugeant bien qu'il n'y faisait bon.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 146.

After describing her journey, and the messenger sent her from Darnley, she says—(we quote indiscriminately from the Scotch or English translation, as the sense seems to be best rendered):—

'He said he was so glad to see me that he welcomed to die for gladness. He found great fault that I was pensive. I departed to supper. This

Digitized by Google

bearer will tell you of my arriving; he prayed me to return, the which I did. He declared to me his sickness, [grief,] and that he would make no testament, but only leave all things to me, and that I was the cause of his malady because of the regret he had that I was so strange to him. And thus, he said, "You ask me what I mean by the cruelty contained in my letter, it is of you alone that will not accept my offers of repentance. I confess that I have failed, but not into that which I ever denied, and so have many other of your subjects, and you have well pardoned them: . . . . I am young . . . . May not a man of my age, for lack of counsel, fall twice or thrice, or in lack of his promise, and at last repent himself and be chastised by experience? If I may obtain pardon, I protest I shall never make fault again; and I crave no other thing but that we may be at bed and board together as man and wife, and if you will not consent hereunto I will never rise from this sick-bed. I pray you tell me your resolution. God knows how I am punished for making my god of you, and for having no other thought but on you." . . . . I did still answer him, but that would be too long to write at length. . . . . In the end he desired much that I should lodge in his lodging. I have refused. . . . . He said to me, "I have heard say you have brought a litter with you, but I would rather have gone with yourself." I told him that so I would myself bring him to Craigmillar, that his physicians and I also might serve him without being far from my son. He said he was ready when I would . . . . as for myself he would rather lose his life than do me the least displeasure, and used so many kind flatteries, so coldly, and so wisely, as you would marvel at. . . . . He would not let me go, but would have me to watch with him. I made as though I thought all to be true, and would think upon it. I have excused myself from sitting up with him this night, for he says that he sleeps not well; you never heard him speak better nor more humbly. And if I had not proof of his heart to be as wax, and that mine were not as a diamond whereunto no shot can make breach but that which comes forth of your hand, I would have almost had pity on him. But fear not, the place shall hold unto the death. Remember, in recompense thereof, that you suffer not yours to be won by that false race that would do no less to yourself. I believe they have been at school together; he has ever the tear in his eye: he salutes every body, yea, unto the least, and makes piteous caressing unto them, to make them have pity upon him . . . . This is my first day's work, I shall end the same to-morrow. I write all things, though they be of little weight. . . . . I am in doing a work here that I hate greatly. Have you not desire to laugh to see me lie so well, at the least to dissemble so well, and to tell him truth so betwixt hands. He hath shown me all on the bishop's behalf, and on Sunderland, without touching any word to him of that which you showed me, but only by much flattering him, and praying him to assure himself of me. . . . . You have heard the rest. We are tied to two false races . . . God forgive me. God knit us together for ever, for the most faithful couple that ever he united. This is my faith: I will die in it. Excuse if I write ill, you may guess the half of it, but I cannot mend it because I am not well at ease, and yet very glad to write unto you when the rest are sleeping. . . . . I am weary and asleep, and yet cannot forbear scribbling as long as there is any paper.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 154.

There are many passages unfit for transcription, interspersed again with aspirations for God's blessing, and sentiments of shame at the course she is pursuing. The next day she continues her letter, beginning with speaking of a bracelet she is

Digitized by Google

making him (Bothwell), which he is to keep out of sight, and for the hasty workmanship of which she apologises, and then she remembers the loathed task in hand:—

'I go to my tedious talk. You make me dissemble so much that I am afraid thereof with horror, and you cause me almost to do the office of a traitoress. Remember how, if it were not to obey you, I would rather be dead than do it. My heart bleeds at it.'—*Ibid.* p. 170.

And then another scene with her husband is detailed, in which she brought him round to her wishes:—

'To be short, he will go anywhere upon my word. Alas, I never deceived anybody, but I remit myself wholly to your will, and send me word what I shall do, and whatsoever happen to me, I will obey you. Think also if you cannot find any more secret invention by medicine, for he is to take medicine at Craigmillar and the bath also. He may not come forth of the house this long time. To be short, by all that I can learn he is in great suspicion, and yet, nevertheless, trusts upon my word, but yet not so far that he will show anything to me. But, nevertheless, I shall draw it out of him if you will that I avow all to him. But I shall never be willing to beguile one who puts his trust in me, nevertheless you may do all, and do not esteem me the less for that cause, because for my own particular revenge I would not do it to him. . . . . To conclude, for certainty he suspects of the thing you know and of his life. But as to the last, so soon as I spoke two or three good words to him, he rejoices and is out of doubt. I have not seen him this evening for finishing your bracelet, but I can find no clasp for it. It is ready for them, and yet I fear it should bring you ill-hap, or that it should be known if you are hurt. . . . . Burn this letter, for it is over dangerous, and nothing well said in it, for I am thinking upon nothing but fasherie. . . . . Now seeing, to obey you, my dear life, I spare neither honour, conscience, nor hazard, nor greatness; take it in good part and not after the interpretation of your false brother-in-law, to whom I pray you to give no credit against the most faithful lover that ever you had or shall have. See not also her (his wife) whose feigned tears you ought not more to regard than the true travails which I endure to deserve her place, for obtaining of which, against my own nature, I do betray those that would lett me. God forgive me, and give you, my only friend, the good luck and prosperity that your humble and faithful lover doth wish unto you, who hopeth shortly to be another thing unto you, for the reward of my pains.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. Appendix, p. 146.

The other letters are in much the same strain. They are given in the same work at full length, and also the notes drawn from them by the English and Scotch commissions when the matter was brought before Elizabeth. There is something almost ludicrous, if it were not too revolting a subject for such feelings, in the gravity of these documents. We have, from a paper endorsed by Cecil, 'A brief note of the chief and principall 'poincts of the Quene of Scottes lettres written to Bothaill, 'which may tend to her condemptnation, for her consent and 'procurement of the murder of her husband, as farre forthe as 'we coulde by the reading gather,' and by the Scotch commissioners a longer list coolly separating from the maze of love,

Digitized by Google

hatred, jealousy, and fantastic fancy, which agitated by turns the mind of the writer, such passages as bore on the matter in hand, and transcribing them in their uncouth Scotch translation, as for example—(we simplify the spelling):—

'*Item*, "As to me, howbeit I hear no farther news from you, according to my commission, I bring the man with me to Craigmillar," (where it was at first planned to commit the murder,) on Monday, "where he will be all Wednesday." *Item*, very shortly after: "Summa, ye will say he (Darnley) makes the court to me, of the which I take so great pleasure that I enter never where he is, but incontinent I take the sickness of my side, I am so fashed with it. . . . I pray you advertise me of your news at length, and what I shall do in case ye be not returned when I come there, for, in case ye work not wisely, I see that the whole burden of this will fall upon my shoulders." *Item*, "I pray you, according to your promise, to discharge your heart to me, otherwise I will think that my malheur and the good handling of her that has not the third part of the faithful nor willing obedience unto you that I bear has won, against my will, that advantage over me which the second love of Jason won; not that I would compare you to ane sa unhappy as he was, nor yet myself to ane sa unpitiful a woman as she. Howbeit ye cause me be somewhat like unto her in anything that touches you or that may preserve and keep you to her, to whom you only appertain, if it may be sure that I may appropriate that which is worn though faithful, yea only loving of you, which I do and shall do all the days of my life, for pain and evil that can come thereof."'—*Ilid.* vol. ii. p. 215.

Mary seems to have entertained a great jealousy of Bothwell's wife. Like Cleopatra, she could not, in spite of her power and her matchless attractions, for one moment forget 'the married woman.' The sonnets abound in allusions to her: her 'false tears and feigned affection,' contrasting her own great sacrifices for him:—

'*Elle* pour son honneur vous doibt obeyssance,
Moi vous obeyssant j'en puis recevoir blasme;
N'estant, à mon regret, come elle vostre femme.'[1]

Third Sonnet. Laing, vol. ii. p. 224.

[1] Miss Strickland, in her self-sacrificing devotion to her heroine, summarily sets down all the letters of the casket as forgeries, in a series of arguments which have hardly any semblance of weight and authority when uncontradicted, but which fall to the ground the moment the other side is heard. She thinks the sonnets may have been in Mary's own writing, but because they do not contain any mention of Bothwell's name, suggests that they might have been the composition of some troubadour which she had copied before quitting France. Their apparent relevancy to the matter in hand, would, if this were the case, be one of the most perverse of the many perverse coincidences which Mary's advocates have to assert and to lament over. As conclusive of her views of forgery, she clenches the argument by adducing the following solitary testimony as to the public opinion of Mary's contemporaries. It is in a letter from La Motthe Fenelon, French ambassador to Catharine de Medicis. We cannot receive it as so entirely settling the question:—

'Truly, it is believed *by those of the Queen's side*, that these letters are false, and that those seen are suppositious and counterfeited; and that since their malice and subtlety has been great enough to dispossess a rightful queen of her crown, they would not stand at counterfeiting her hand; and also they allege *that should their queen have done anything of the kind, she never would have done it, excepting under the magic compulsion and sorcery of the Earl of Bothwell*, as he knew well

Digitized by Google

We could go on multiplying extracts and proofs of guilt, but our readers will think we have already given them too much on a most unprofitable theme. We can only assure them that, from respect to them and to our pages, we have refrained from some passages and allusions which are even more conclusive of her guilty hatred and guilty love, while, on the other hand, for what we have given, our apology must rest on our strong sense of the impropriety and mischief of bringing serious charges without also adducing proofs. No man has a right to take away or injure the character of another by his own unsupported word. Nor would we cast an additional slur on the dead without giving the causes and reasons that have influenced us.

The details of the murder we need not enter into; all know that Mary continued her attentions and endearments to the last. She had arranged, through 'Paris,' with Bothwell and Lethington, that the place was to be changed from Craigmillar, to which Darnley had expressed a dislike, to Kirk of Field, on the pretence of its pure air. Thither, when he was well enough to travel in a litter, she took him. Her power over him was truly a *fascination;* he did all she wished him, and yet he mistrusted her. 'I have 'fears enough,' he said to Thomas Crawford, his friend (whose account remains to us); 'but may God judge between us! I 'have her promise only to trust to; but I have put myself in 'her hands, and I shall go with her, though she should murder 'me.' The place was inconveniently small, and unsuited for such high guests; but Mary remained under the same roof with him, while Bothwell was making his arrangements for the murder. Here the help of Hubert, or, as he is called, French Paris, whom the Queen had just received from his service into her own, was necessary. The evidence of this man, which he gave before his execution, throws light upon the whole transaction, and has, of course, been doubted, but bears strong internal evidence of truth. It is given with a garrulous *naïveté*, as if he had really enjoyed easing his mind of his share of the matter. We need not say it is conclusive against the Queen. He seems to have wished to satisfy himself of her share in the work in hand; for when Bothwell bid him move the Queen's bed (her room was exactly under the king's, and her bed just under his), as the gunpowder was to be placed there, Paris neglected the order, and when Mary came into the room in the evening, she herself ordered him to change the position of the bed.

---

that trade, having made it his greatest occupation from the time he was at school, to read and study books of necromancy and forbidden magic.' Here it is observable that the writer does not give his own opinion at all, and next, seems to think that the Queen's friends laid more stress on the magic than the forgery, of which no proof, either here or at any time, is attempted. That must have been regarded as a very hopeless case that had recourse to such a defence.

Digitized by Google

'The Queen said to me, "Fool that you are, I will not have my bed in that place," and so made me remove it; by which words I perceived in my mind that she was aware of the plot. Thereupon I took courage to say to her, "Madam, my Lord Bothwell has commanded me to take to him the keys of your chamber, because he intends to do something in it, namely, (and this explanation is supposed to be to his examiners,) to blow up the King with gunpowder." "Do not talk about that at this hour," said she, "but do what you please." Upon this I did not venture to say anything more.'—*Second Deposition of Paris. Mignet*, vol. i. p. 264. *Laing*, vol. ii. p. 285.

Her self-possession and regard for little things at that time, are amongst the most terrible traits of her character, and connect her in our minds with many of the world's great historic criminals: the well-known care for the new velvet bed, on the ground that it would be soiled by Darnley's bath, and the substitution of an old purple travelling-bed in its place; also, her great solicitude about a rich coverlet of fur which she would not have blown up along with her husband. The Queen remained with Darnley in his room on Sunday night, till those who were in the secret could hear the fatal sounds of preparations going on below, so that Bothwell came down to bid them make less noise. He returned to the King's room with Paris, a signal that all was ready; who had not been there but the 'length of a paternoster,' when the Queen, affecting to remember that she had promised to be present at a mask on the marriage of one of her servants, suddenly quitted the place, and left her victim to his fate.

'He beheld her departure with grief and secret fear. The unhappy prince, as though foreboding the mortal danger by which he was threatened, sought consolation in the Bible, and read the fifty-fifth Psalm, which contained many passages adapted to his peculiar circumstances. After his devotion, he went to bed and fell asleep, Taylor, his young page, lying beside him in the same apartment.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 266.

The noise of the explosion which followed awoke all Edinburgh. With what sound did it fall on Mary's ears, who, in the midst of her festivities, must have been listening and watching for it? This can never be known; we only know that the first person admitted to her presence afterwards was the murderer. At ten o'clock on the following morning, the news having been previously told her, she had got up all the external signs of mourning. Paris entered the Queen's chamber, from which the daylight was excluded, her bed, from which she had not yet risen, was hung with black, and one of her ladies was giving her her breakfast. Here Bothwell came in, and had a secret conference with her under the curtain. He soon left her, and reported to those without that the Queen was overwhelmed with grief. The day after, she sent the following cool account of the matter to the Archbishop of Glasgow, her ambassador at Paris:—

Digitized by Google

'*Edinburgh, Feb.* 10, 1567.

'Most Reverend Father in God, and trusted Counsellor, we greet you well.

'We have received this morning your letters of the 27th of January, by your servant, Robert Drury, containing in one part sic advertisement as we find by effect over true, albeit the success has not altogether been sic as the authors of that mischievous fact had preconceived and had put it in execution; an if God in his mercy had not preserved us as we trust to the end, that we may take a rigorous vengeance of that mischievous deed, which ere it should remain unpunished we had rather lose life and all. The matter is so horrible and strange, as we believe the like was never heard of in any country.

'This night past, being the 9th of February, a little after two hours after midnight, the house wherein the king was lodged was, in one instant, blown into the air, he lying asleep in his bed, with *sic* a vehemency that of the whole lodging, walls and other, there is nothing remaining; na, not a stone above another, but all either carried far away or *dang* in dross to the very ground stone. It must be done by the force of gunpowder, and appears to have been a mine. By whom it has been done, or in what manner, appears not yet.

'We doubt not, but according to the diligence our council has begun already to use, the certainty of all shall be *usit* shortly, and the same being discovered, which we *wot* God will not suffer to lie hid, we hope to punish the same with sic rigour as shall serve for example of this cruelty to all ages to come. Always whoever has taken this wicked enterprise in hand we assure ourself it was dressit as well for ourself as for the king, (for we lay for the most part of all last week in that same lodging, and was there accompanied with the most part of the lords that were in this town) and that same night at midnight, and of very chance tarried not all night there by reason of some masks at the abbey (Holyrood): But we believe it was not chance but God that put in our head.

'We despatched this bearer upon the sudden; therefore write to you the more shortly. The rest of the letter we shall answer at more leisure within four or five days by your own servant. And so for the present we commit you to Allmighty God.

'At Edinburgh the 11th day of Feb. 1566-67.'—*Letters of Mary Queen of Scots*, vol. i. p. 44.

Mary, after the murder, manifested an uncommon dislike to the mention of Darnley's name, which is one of the nearest approaches to remorse that we can find in her. What she said to the Archbishop in this letter she maintained through life, when forced to speak of him at all. But though we see from this example that she did not affect to consider her feelings wounded by the event, there was something about the affair that she would rather keep out of sight. Is there anything in history more detestable than the whole of this letter? The coldness, the hypocrisy, the falsehood; and yet it was by her adherence in the course here first adopted that she, in fact,

[1] To this letter Miss Strickland appends the following extraordinary comment: 'If Mary had had any evil intentions against poor Darnley, she must have given some hint of them to her chief confidant the Archbishop, to whom this letter was addressed.'

Digitized by Google

gained over her adherents in her own and present times. Partly, it is hard to believe in that long subsequent life of impenitence; men are shaken, in spite of their reason, by consistent assertion and consistent denial. She would be too wicked if it were all true! So, as soon as the overwhelming evidence is a little shoved out of sight by other coming events, Mary gets the benefit of these misgivings and difficulties. But, in fact, her guilt is indefinitely increased by this obstinacy in it. Every good Christian ought to stand aghast at such a picture of impenitent sin. We are tempted here, though out of chronological order, to show our readers what is M. Mignet's mode of judging of character, and how far we are to value anything but his *facts;* and to begin with his just and fair notice of her conduct immediately after the murder:—

'What was the effect produced upon Mary Stuart by this terrible occurrence which filled Edinburgh with indignation and mistrust? She appeared overwhelmed with sorrow and fell into a state of silent dejection. She manifested none of that activity, anger, resolution, and courage which she had displayed after Riccio's murder: but shut herself up in her room, and would communicate with her most faithful servants by the medium of Bothwell alone. Darnley's murderer was the only person admitted to her presence. Even were we not furnished with the most unquestionable proofs of her complicity by the confessions contained in her letters, the authenticity of which we have established elsewhere, as well as by the declarations made in presence of their judges and upon the scaffold, by the subaltern actors in this tragic drama, her conduct both before and after the murder would suffice to convince us that she was a party to the crime.' —*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 272.

He then recapitulates what we have already gone through, and continues:—

'But if her conduct previous to the commission of the crime thus deeply criminates Mary Stuart, what must we think of her proceedings after its perpetration? Her behaviour, both as a wife and a queen, render her guilt all the more flagrant, because far from avenging the husband upon whom she had so recently lavished her hypocritical caresses, she rewarded his murderer, and eventually married him.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 273.

Having thus established her guilt so entirely to his own and others' satisfaction, we must show our readers what is the occasion M. Mignet chooses for a burst of admiration for this wicked queen. We somewhat purposely anticipate the course of events, that our readers may not be tempted to the very common error, that distance of time softens unrepented sin; that is, that a criminal without an act of repentance is, in fact, by the mere passage of time, in some sort cleansed from his crime. We do not believe that M. Mignet could have expressed himself as he does in the following passage, had the scene he describes taken place within a week of Darnley's murder, instead of after a lapse of two years of deserved misfortune; and if, instead of some chapters'

Digitized by Google

change of subject, he had had to proceed to the recording of it before the ink of the last sentence was dry or the page turned over. When Mary took refuge in England, and was detained by Elizabeth, the charge of murdering her husband was brought against her by her own subjects, who supported the charge by producing the letters in the silver casket. Many hard words are applied to Elizabeth, for pressing for a direct answer; for urging Mary, in fact, to defend herself from the charge, giving her the choice of three separate modes of doing so.

'Mary declined this insidious request. She would not condescend to appear as the accused party. Adroit and courageous, sometimes perplexed but never cast down, she now displayed all the resources of her mind and all the energy of her character. After having tried every means to prevent the publication of the documents which criminated her; after having had recourse to the skilful manœuvres of Lethington and the prudent counsels of Norfolk; after having once offered to abdicate, and frequently to forgive, even when she was most grievously offended—she now stood up with all the dignity of a queen, and proved herself as bold as she had previously appeared accommodating. Instead of defending herself, she attacked Murray. On the 19th of December she wrote to her Commissioners: "Forasmuch as the Earl of Murray and his adherents our rebellious subjects, have added unto their pretended excuses, produced by them for colouring of their horrible crimes and offences committed against us their sovereign lady and mistress, the charge that, as the Earl of Bothwell was the principal executor of the murder committed on the person of Harry Stuart our late husband, so we knew, counselled, devised, persuaded, and commanded the said murder,—they have falsely, treacherously, and wickedly lied; maliciously imputing to us a crime of which themselves were authors and inventors, and some of them even executors." Repelling the charge of having impeded the proceedings of justice against Darnley's murderers, and of having given her consent beforehand to her marriage of Bothwell, she alluded with consummate ability and eloquence to the danger to which the lords declared that she had exposed her son: [she had in fact wished to give him into Bothwell's hands.] "That calumny," she pathetically observed, "should suffice for proof of all the rest. The natural love of a mother towards her bairn confounds them; but in the malice and impiety of their hearts, they judge others by their own affection." '—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 53.

For our own part, so far are we from sharing in M. Mignet's admiration of this unparalleled audacity, that we find ourselves on the contrary responding in a way we could not have anticipated, to Knox's denunciations of the course and character of this woman; his language is strong, we do not defend a subject for using such language towards her who once at least was his sovereign; but our readers shall judge if it is not in most points deserved. It is from one of his sermons:—

'I am further accused, that I speak of their sovereign (mine she is not) as that she were reprobate, affirming that she cannot repent; thereto I answer, that the accuser is a calumniator and a manifest liar, for he is never able to prove that at any time I have said that she could not repent; but I have said, and yet say, that pride and repentance abide not in one.

Digitized by Google

heart of any long continuance. . . . What I have spoken against the adultery, against the murders, against the pride, and against the idolatry of that wicked woman, I spake not as one that entered into God's secret counsel, but being one, of God's great mercy, called to preach according to His blessed will revealed in His Holy Word, I have oftener than once pronounced the threatenings of His law against such as have been of counsel, knowledge, assistance, or consent, that innocent blood should be shed.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 287.

There is something in simple magnitude which attracts some minds; even a crime may be pardoned if it is only large enough and maintained with spirit enough. We have traced Mary's aptitude for so great a crime to her education in the Court of France, and to the principles which she imbibed there. The murder of Darnley and its consequences were direct fruits of those principles and of that teaching; and, as a remarkable confirmation of this view, we find the same teaching producing the very same results in France itself, only two years after. We need hardly remind the youngest or the most forgetful of our readers, that the Massacre of S. Bartholomew was designed and carried out by those who had especially the direction of Mary's education, Catharine de Medicis and the Cardinal of Lorraine; and by her fellow-pupils, Charles IX. and his brother, the Duke of Anjou. And in the crimes themselves there are many points of resemblance; in part arising from the dissimulation which is the feature and crowning aggravation of each; and also from the circumstances themselves, which in the domestic act of treachery anticipate on a small scale, and shadow forth, those of the more gigantic enormity. Nor are there wanting points of striking analogy in the minor personage. Each tragedy has its innocent, accidental victim. And the Lady Jane Gordon, forced to a divorce from her husband, represents Margaret of France, compelled to a marriage against her heart and feelings; each being equally gainers by the act of injustice and apparent cruelty. Mary represents the king and court of France; Darnley must stand for the Admiral and the Huguenot party; and the Kirk of Field is Paris.

Mary's open, impulsive, impetuous temper is sometimes brought forward to show her naturally incapable of an act of deliberate perfidy. But Charles's disposition might have been supposed quite as great an obstacle to his long-sustained effort of patient, watchful, insidious, profound dissimulation. Mary had only Darnley to delude; Charles was matched with Coligni and his party, able men, whose lives had been passed in suspicion, experienced in the arts of deception, and in the task of unmasking the covert designs of the most perfidious court in the world. Mary had but a few days of dissembling; Charles, for many months, might not relax nor indulge himself in one

Digitized by Google

natural outbreak. What must it not have cost a young king, absolute in position, impatient in temper, and utterly unscrupulous in principle, to maintain that long course of concession to his enemies, by which he at length gained his ends! from that first conference with his mother and the other conspirators, up to the successful issue of the plot formed there; the feigned peace,—the support of the Protestant religion, and severe repression of the outrages of his own party against it;—his affected displeasure with the House of Guise;—the disgrace into which he brought himself with his Catholic allies, Spain and the Pope, by a course which he could neither justify nor explain;—the connecting himself by the forced marriage of his sister with one of the detested heretics—the whole series of measures necessary to bring within his net the Huguenots whom he had resolved to exterminate. What unremitting watchfulness, what self-restraint were necessary: what sacrifices must be made to lull their jealous suspicions, what perpetual benignity of aspect veiling the smothered rage within, what toleration of high pretensions and bold demands must he persevere in!—but the end reconciled him to all. That it was an effort we know from that scene with his mother, when he believed her to have let out the plot, and he, on his side,

'grievously complained to her that she should have made known those secrets, which he with so much patience, and resistance from his own mind, putting constraint on his natural disposition, had concealed; to which words the queen, smiling, replied that she did not need to learn from him the art of silence, bidding him to consider if he himself, by his own impatience, had not let out what he suspected others to have done.'[1]

That he succeeded we know, not only from the result but from the *naïve* admiration Davila expresses for a crowning act of dissimulation by which he distinguished himself. This was on the occasion of Coligni's arrival at Paris.

'It was a notable thing (*cosa notabile*) to see the Admiral, grown old in ambitious pretensions and proud thoughts, now conscious in himself of his errors; all France for the theatre, and before the eyes of his own partisans; brought to so public a repentance, that he was seen with a copious effusion of tears, prostrated at the knees of that king whom he had so frequently offended; *but it was much more notable* that the king, so young in years, of a nature so precipitate and irascible, now seeing before him the man who had so often endangered his crown and dominion, knew how to dissemble so perfectly, that, calling him father and raising him with his own hands, he made every one believe him to be sincerely and entirely reconciled to him.'—*Davila*, vol. ii. p. 273.

Coligni's attempted assassination, under the King's orders, and the subsequent visit of affectionate condolence paid to the wounded man by Charles and his mother, and the surrounding

[1] Davila's 'Historia di Francia,' vol. ii. p. 269.

Digitized by Google

him with his own guard, in pretended care for his safety, are all points of analogy with Mary's course, which we need not dwell upon. Mary, it is true, eventually denied her share in the murder, and Charles avowed his; but he had designed to conceal it, depending upon a despairing insurrection of the Huguenots, which did not take place; so that the massacre was obliged to be a more orderly and deliberate affair than it had been planned to be. What lies were left to him to tell we need not say he did tell. Perhaps in one point Charles and his mother stand in honourable distinction from Mary, for she would have given up her infant son to the murderer of its father, if she could; and Catharine and her son, having connected themselves by the ties of blood to Henry of Navarre, found themselves almost, to their surprise, bound by them, so that they used exertions, and disobliged the Duke of Guise, in order to save him and his brother: an act of impolicy, according to Davila; who, treating the whole affair as a political coup d'état, remarks on the great mistake it is to mingle isolated acts of mercy with 'extreme measures.'

And now to return to our narrative. However anxious, for various motives, historians have been to release Mary from the actual guilt of her husband's death,—some from political, some from religious reasons; some from a chivalrous gallantry towards the sex, of which she was externally so fair an ornament, and some indulging the subtle intellectual pleasure of disputing obvious conclusions,—writers may be called unanimous in their admission that Mary did all she could by her subsequent conduct to attach the guilt to herself. Nothing could be more shameless, more blind to common decency, more utterly insensible, than the course into which she immediately plunged. Feeling no remorse, and expressing no sorrow, she was simply intoxicated by one sentiment. She cared for no one but Bothwell, and she allowed every individual in her kingdom to see that this was so. Never, we must say, was the principle of loyalty put to so terrible a test. While the whole world—not suspected, but—*knew* him to be the murderer, she would not endure him out of sight; while high and low felt the deed a national reproach, within a fortnight she was playing games, 'shooting at the butts with him at Seton, and forcing those 'lords who lost with them to pay the forfeit in a dinner.' Engaged in these becoming recreations, she took no active steps towards discovering her husband's murderers; her first care, on the contrary, was to reward various subordinate actors in it by places and pensions.[1] She had, it is true, on the 12th of

[1] Laing, vol. i. pp. 34—48.

Digitized by Google

February, offered a reward of £2,000 to any who would come forward with information—something must be done for the sake of appearances to foreign courts, and

'Scarcely was this made known, when public opinion gave voice to its convictions, and a paper was fixed during the night on the doors of the Tolbooth, or common prison, in which Bothwell, James Balfour, and David Chambers (another of Bothwell's intimates) were denounced as guilty of the king's slaughter. Voices, too, were heard in the streets of Edinburgh at dead of night, arraigning the same persons. A second placard charged the queen's servants with the crime, and mentioned the names of Signor Francis, Bastian, John de Bourdeaux, and Joseph, David Rizzio's brother. The Queen took no steps to secure the subaltern conspirators, and kept the greatest criminal of them all by her side.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 274.

No council was assembled, and nothing was done. Pictured placards appeared in public places:—the initials, M. R., holding a sword, and Bothwell's, with another instrument of death. The Presbyterian ministers preached with 'sombre vehemence,' exhorting men to fasting and prayer, and calling on God 'to reveal and revenge.' The Queen's complicity became more and more suspected. Bothwell rode into Edinburgh with an armed force, and bullied and threatened, but by his suspicious and guilty bearing, only confirmed men's minds against him. Darnley's father wrote pathetic letters, imploring Mary to take steps to discover the murderer; to which she returned affectionate but evasive answers. Elizabeth wrote to her, as *we* think, a very good and sensible letter, giving Mary the advice of a true friend, though Mignet characterises it very harshly: our readers shall judge. It is a specimen of the sort of language he always uses towards our great Queen.

'Elizabeth despatched a letter, by Sir Henry Killigrew, in which she hinted her suspicions of Mary's implication in the murder, and displayed *the passionate hatred which she entertained against her*, in the vehemence of her ill-concealed reproaches, and the feigned character of her hypocritical condolence: "Madam," she wrote, "my ears have been so astonished, and my mind so grieved, and my heart so terrified at hearing the horrible sound of the abominable murder of your late husband and my deceased cousin, that I have, even now, no spirit to write about it; and although my natural feelings constrain me greatly to deplore his death, as he was so near a relation to me, nevertheless boldly to tell you what I think, I cannot conceal from myself that I am more full of grief on your account than on his. O Madam! I should not perform the part of a faithful cousin and an affectionate friend, if I studied rather to please your ears than to endeavour to preserve your honour; therefore I will not conceal from you what most persons say about the matter, namely, that you will look through your fingers at taking vengeance for this deed, and have no intention to touch those who have done you this kindness, as if the act would not have been perpetrated unless the murderers had received assurance of your impunity. Think of me, I beg you, who would not entertain such a thought in my heart for all the gold in the world." She then went on to urge her, in the strongest terms, not to leave so great a crime unpunished. "I exhort you," she adds; "I advise and beseech you to take this thing so much to heart

Digitized by Google

as not to fear to bring to judgment the nearest relation you have, and to let no persuasion hinder you from manifesting to the world that you are a noble Princess, and also a loyal wife."'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 279.

Letters of condolence are proverbially difficult things, and should always be read with the tenderest indulgence. Who would desire his heart or his understanding to be tested by his own performances in this line? But we must say the difficulty is indefinitely increased when it seems probable, from circumstances, that the person addressed is herself the main cause of the catastrophe we deplore; while yet it would be as unjust as it would be discourteous, to charge our correspondent downright with the fact. Indeed, *suspicion* is all that is in the mind; we do not *believe*, we only misdoubt. So we think, on the whole, that Elizabeth did very well; and are only glad it does not fall to our lot to have such a correspondent. Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow and ambassador in France, writes in just the same strain; imploring her to use vigorous means to bring the offenders to justice; informing her that in France 'yourself 'is greatly and wrongously calumniated to be the principal 'motive of the same;' conjuring her to take a rigorous vengeance, observing, 'that rather than it be not actually taken, it appears to me better, in this world, that you had lost life and all.' Mary, however, had sinned, and risked all, for the present—for present pleasure; this she would have, and was perfectly headstrong and bewitched in her methods of obtaining it. Therefore, when compelled to have Bothwell tried, she so managed, and used such palpable and manifest injustice, as still more to implicate herself and him. She utterly despised not only popular opinion, but every form of it. She had still some difficulties in the way of attaining her ultimate object; serious ones to most minds, but mere straws to her in her present disposition. First, Bothwell *must* be tried for Darnley's murder; secondly, he was already married to another woman; and, thirdly, her husband had been dead but a few weeks. She chose to overcome these obstacles in this order: Bothwell, himself ordering all the arrangements of his trial, and attended by four thousand armed men, loaded by her favours, supported by her public countenance, and mounted on the late king's favourite horse, presented himself for trial, and was tried and acquitted, no one appearing against him, and, as a sequel to this scene, he procured, by an act of bullying audacity, which was a lasting disgrace to the Scotch nobility, a bond signed by many of them, recommending his marriage with the queen. Next, she contrived with him the celebrated abduction to which some of the letters in the casket relate; a very barefaced piece of acting, by which she affected to show herself to her people a prisoner to Bothwell's

Digitized by Google

unprincipled violence, and her actions therefore no longer in her own power. This affair came off on the 24th of April; he met her with an armed force, as she was returning from a visit to her son, and taking her horse by the bridle, carried her off to the castle of Dunbar. While here, the divorce with his wife was effected;—in the Catholic courts, in behalf of Bothwell, through that consistorial court whose powers she had restored *before* the murder; in the Protestant, in behalf of Jane Gordon, his wife; his previous course of life furnishing sufficient ground. The sentence was pronounced on the 3d of May, and on that day Mary returned to Edinburgh with Bothwell by her side, where she declared his pardon not only for the late outrage on herself, but *for all other offences*, and announced her intention of marrying him. Although this had long been expected, it filled the country with furious indignation; no fair words or promises could silence the Presbyterian ministers in their denunciations, Craig refused to publish the banns till the law compelled him, and then added from the pulpit these words: 'I take heaven and 'earth to witness that I abhor and detest this marriage as 'odious and slanderous to the world, and I would exhort the 'faithful to pray earnestly that a union against all reason and 'good conscience may yet be overruled by God to the comfort 'of this unhappy realm.' Nothing daunted, Mary, on the 12th of May, created Bothwell Duke of the Orkneys and Shetland, and placed the coronet on his head with her own hands. On the 15th she was married.

From this period date Mary's *misfortunes*, as they are always called; that is, being permitted to attain the object for which she had sinned, she was not allowed to enjoy it with impunity. From that moment vengeance and retribution opened on their pursuit, nor once lost sight of their victim till she paid the forfeit of her crime with her own blood. And this should never be forgotten by those who read her subsequent history. It is true that Mary, who had made a mockery of law and justice when it suited her purpose, suffered in her turn from the neglect of their requirements. But we must never say that Mary suffered unjustly. We may charge Elizabeth with harshness and duplicity; she may have erred, and did err, in assuming rights she did not possess; but Mary's punishment was not the less, as far as she is concerned, a just one.

The very day of her marriage she had a quarrel with her husband; he seems to have discovered that the best mode of sustaining her affection was to be continually testing it. He was rough and harsh in his demeanour, suspicious, jealous, exacting, and it was her pleasure, while her affection lasted, to submit to all this. Her letters to him previous to the marriage

Digitized by Google

are in an abject strain of deprecation. 'Refuse me not, dear 'life, and suffer me to make some proof by my obedience, my 'faithfulness, constancy, and *voluntary subjection*.' 'I would 'I were dead, for I see all goeth ill . . . Absence hath power 'over you, who have two strings to your bow' [another wife]. 'I desire not but sudden death, and to testify unto you how 'lowly I submit myself unto your commandments. I have sent 'you in sign of *homage*,' &c. It was a favourite form with Mary to wish herself dead, as we see in these letters; on her wedding day she was heard to call for a knife 'to stick herself, or else,' she added, 'I shall drown myself.' She was, in fact, subject to paroxysms of rage, when things were going very ill indeed with her, though ordinarily her temper was not at fault; and now Bothwell was interfering with her freedom of action. 'Even since the day of her marriage,' wrote Du Croc to Catharine de Medici, 'she has passed her time in nothing but 'tears and lamentation, as he (Bothwell) will not give her 'liberty to look at any one, or allow any one to look at her 'although he knows that she loves to take her pleasure and 'pass her time agreeably, as much as any one.' However, these were only lovers' quarrels, from which they were soon aroused by the serious aspect of their affairs. A formidable league had been formed against them, of the chief nobility; nor should the anxiety of the court of France to join them be forgotten, as it was a fact very likely to influence Mary in her final choice of an asylum.

'In fact, the court of France, seeing that Mary Stuart multiplied the commission of degrading disorders and destructive errors, and fearing that Scotland might thereby fall under the dominion of England, had preferred to abandon the Queen rather than lose the kingdom. Charles IX. sent Villeroy to Du Croc with secret instructions, from which we extract the following curious passage:—"The said Sieur de Villeroy will say that his Majesty having made known to him the opinion which he entertains of the pitiable success of the affairs of the Queen of Scotland, seeing what has been written to him of her behaviour by the said Sieur du Croc, and the strange news which he has received from other quarters; and being also concerned that the enterprise of the said lords is secretly assisted and favoured by the English—whose charity would only entail their ruin—the King wishes the said Sieur du Croc to know, that the desire and principal intention of his Majesty is to keep the kingdom of Scotland in its attachment to himself, without permitting it, under the pretext of the many follies which are committed, to rebel and alienate itself from its attachment to himself, as it is certain it would do, towards the said English, whom the said lords would seek as their protectors in this affair, if they saw they would have no assurance from the King." It appears that Du Croc, in conformity with these instructions, offered the confederate lords a company of men-at-arms, and pensions to several noblemen and gentlemen.'—*Mignet*, vol. i. p. 307.

But the confederates preferred to have the support of Eliza-

Digitized by Google

beth. And here began her difficulties—and very genuine ones they were throughout, though not always creditable ones. Her feelings and principles were entirely opposed to rebellion, under any circumstances. She was sincerely shocked at the thought of deposition—it was a personal question with her; and also at subjects standing up in judgment on their princes' faults. On the other hand, all respect for Mary must have been at an end; it was not possible to regard as sacred the rights of such a woman, and it would never do to allow France to get so powerful a hold upon Scotland as was threatened. So Mignet, after reflections on her tortuous policy, and on actions rarely corresponding with words, concludes with Cecil's promise to the lords, to make his mistress's feelings subordinate to her interests, and to lead her, slowly but surely, to adopt those resolutions which were least agreeable but most advantageous. Mary at first despised the threatened danger, but was soon compelled to view it in a more serious light; and just a month from the date of her marriage, we find her taking the field in person, 'mounted 'on horseback, preceded by the royal standard of Scotland, and 'dressed in a red gown which reached only to her knees.' The confederates hearing of her intrenching herself on Carberry hill, advanced from Edinburgh to give her battle, bearing a banner on which was painted the body of the murdered King lying under a tree, with the young Prince kneeling beside it, and underneath, the motto, '*Judge and avenge my cause, O Lord!*' The sight of this banner greatly moved the people, animated the confederate soldiers, and affected the loyalty of the Queen's men. At this crisis Du Croc attempted to effect a compromise, but he found the Queen very resolute and animated, and not at all willing for a compromise, though she promised pardon on their submission. Then followed proposals for settling the affair by single combat. Bothwell was ready to fight for his cause, and on the other side there were contentions for the office of champion; but in the meanwhile desertion began amongst her own troops, and Mary at length found herself forced to treat with her rebel subjects; and she agreed to deliver herself up to the confederates if they would allow Bothwell to escape; they in their turn promising, on condition of his dismissal, to return to their allegiance. And thus Mary took leave of her husband, probably with the hope of soon being rejoined by him. They were observed to speak together with much agitation, and then to separate 'with great anguish and grief.' 'Bothwell asked the Queen whether she would keep the promise 'of fidelity which she had made to him, of which she assured 'him, and gave him her hand upon it. Thereupon he mounted 'his horse, with a small company of about a dozen of his friends,

Digitized by Google

'and went off at a gallop, taking the road to Dunbar.' She never saw him again.

Mary's love was not of a nature to bear a long absence, nor was he an object for pure attachment; yet for a few weeks or months she clung obstinately to him, after which time his remembrance, for all we know, passed away from her. She got engaged in other plots, and had new objects, to whom she must at least pretend to give her interest. He disappears from the scene till, eight or nine years after, we again come upon the mention of his name. Our readers will remember Bothwell's fate;—that he turned pirate, was captured by a Norwegian vessel, and kept prisoner in Norway till 1576, when he died mad. However, there was a rumour of a confession, and Mary thus writes on the event to her ambassador at Paris:—

'I have been informed of the death of the Count of Bothwell, and that before his decease he made an ample confession of his faults, and declared himself the author and guilty of the assassination of the late king my husband, of which he frees me, expressly swearing upon the damnation of his soul for my innocence, &c.'—*Laing*, vol. ii. p. 307.

She bids Beton, therefore, try to procure this confession. He in his turn, coldly answers that he had heard of it long ago, and that it had given her son great joy, but that he could not procure an authentic copy without money for the messenger's journey, to which Mary (who really never wanted money) replies coolly enough—'It seems to me that the journey of 'Monceaux (her messenger) is not necessary for this purpose, 'as from what you tell me the Queen-mother has sent:' and so the authentic copy never came.[1] But this is a peep into the cold future. Mary, after this parting, gave herself up to the confederates, from whom she received a loyal and courteous reception; but on seeking to communicate with the Hamiltons, who had collected a body of men in her cause, she found herself no longer a queen, but a prisoner. The confederates feared a renewal of the war, and the recal of Bothwell, and would not permit her to hold correspondence with her partisans. Upon this she first realized her position, and giving way to most impolitic but not unnatural anger, exhibited all the 'rage, resentment, and despair,' especially attributed to

'Youthful kings in battle seized alive,

and for once forgot both policy and dissembling. She called for Lindsey, and bade him give her his hand. He obeyed.

[1] Upon this Laing is certainly justified in saying 'The testament is a shallow forgery, of which Mary and Beton were both conscious; and Bothwell himself, as he died mad, was incapable of a genuine confession at his death.'—*Laing* vol. ii. p. 51.

Digitized by Google

'By the hand,' said she, 'which is now in yours, I'll have your head for this.' Morton and Athol she threatened to 'hang and crucify,' with other impotent threats which only served to widen the breach by showing the use she would make of power should she ever be suffered to regain it. However, Mr. Fraser Tytler admires her spirit, quoting her really effective promise of vengeance to Lindsey, and keeping in the background the wilder fury of her threats of crucifixion. He thus describes her miserable entrance into her capital. He is disgusted with her people's reception of her, and their indignation expresses itself no doubt in a sufficiently barbarous mode. The passage is remarkable to us as containing some evidence of remorse. It was the consciousness of her crime alone which caused her despair. A most wretched picture it is:—

'It was now evening, and the Queen, riding between Morton and Athol, was conducted to the capital, where she awoke to all the horrors of her situation. She was a captive in the hands of her worst enemies. The populace, as she rode through the streets, received her with yells and execrations; the women, pressing round, accused her in coarse terms as an adulteress stained with her husband's blood; and the soldiers, unrestrained by their officers, kept constantly waving before her eyes the banner on which was painted the murdered King, and the Prince crying for vengeance. At first they shut her up in the provost's house, where she was strictly guarded. It was in vain she remonstrated against the breach of faith; in vain she implored them to remember she was their sovereign; they were deaf to her entreaties, and she was compelled to pass the night, secluded even from her women, in solitude and tears. But the morning only brought new horrors. The first object which met her eyes was the same dreadful banner, which, with a refinement of cruelty, the populace had hung up directly opposite her window. The sight brought an agony of despair and delirium, in the midst of which she tore the dress from her person, and forgetting that she was almost naked, attempted in her frenzy to address the people.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. 113.

But we will not pursue the familiar course of history—her imprisonment at Lochleven, her obstinate adherence to Bothwell, the discovery of the casket, the threatened trial by her own subjects, from which she was preserved by Elizabeth; the forced abdication,—drawn from her, there is good reason to believe, by the knowledge of the fatal evidence that existed against her; —her escape, the final battle, her flight into England, and the life of imprisonment which followed. Mary's history had events enough in it to furnish excitement for a very long life; what then must have been the tumult of existence in which her six years in Scotland were past? Within *seven* years she had had three husbands, and had been queen of two kingdoms; had headed campaigns in person; had suppressed insurrections and outwitted statesmen, subdued enemies, fought battles; had found time in these severe occupations for all the delights of society and for every form of amusement; she had had innumerable

Digitized by Google

admirers, and had experienced every gradation of sentiment, from simple coquetry to the most enthralling passion; she had known too the darkest excitements of conspiracy and crime:—always changing scene, and place, and occupation; riding, hunting, dancing, fighting, alternating from failure to triumph, from success to despair, and sustained through all by high spirits, reckless courage, and indomitable pride. What recollections, what habits, what dispositions and character were these with which to plunge suddenly into the monotony of a lifelong imprisonment!

That truly must have been a strong spirit which never once failed or yielded under the trial,—which for twenty years planned, and schemed, and flattered, plotted, conspired, cajoled, and we must add, *lied* with unabated energy and unflagging hope; and this under the consciousness of a great crime, and the, to her, heavier consciousness that all with whom she had to deal knew and were fully persuaded of her guilt. What bold bad woman was it who said, '*Une femme comme moi n'est jamais compromise?*' This must have been Mary's confidence, a trust in resources which could not be exhausted—a belief that if she could only see men, she could win them—a knowledge of the power of her very remarkable position and her lofty pretensions. There was another thing, too, to sustain her in captivity.

Writers talk much of Elizabeth's hatred of Mary. We believe Mary's feeling towards Elizabeth was a much deeper one. Elizabeth hated Mary,[1] (we take it for granted, as so many say so,) because she was a thorn in her side, the pretender to her throne, her prisoner whom she dare not set at liberty, and yet could plead no just right to detain; one who was perpetually putting her to difficulties; a load on her fears, on her conscience, and on her credit. But Mary hated Elizabeth, because

[1] Mr. Frazer Tytler quotes a reported message of Elizabeth to Cecil at the time when Mary was a prisoner at Lochleven, and in danger of her life from the vengeance of her subjects, which we think points to her general state of mind towards her, and proves that her 'hatred' was not proof against pity for her condition, nor against the accusings of conscience for her own want of strict integrity in her dealings with her. 'Tell Cecil that he must instantly write a letter, in my name, 'to my sister, to which I will set my hand, for I cannot write it myself, as I have 'not used her well and faithfully in these broken matters that be past. The 'purport of it must be to let her know that the Earl of Murray never spoke 'defamedly of her for the death of her husband, [it was before any commu-'nication could have reached Elizabeth from him on the subject of the casket,] 'never plotted for the secret conveying of the Prince into England, never con-'federated with the lords to depose her: on the contrary, and in my sister's misery 'let her learn from me this truth, and that is, that she has not a more faithful and 'honourable servant in Scotland.'—*Tytler*, vol. vii. p. 130.

There is nothing mysterious or unfathomable in this. No triumph in her rival's misery, but a natural revulsion of feeling towards her.

Digitized by Google

she knew she was known and despised by her, because her crimes had put her in her power, and even more because she was something to think of, and some one on whom to lay the blame for her misfortunes, diverting the train of bitter thought from herself. She was an object for revenge, some one to plot against, to hope against, to ruin if she could. Elizabeth in the multiplicity of her affairs could think only occasionally of Mary. Elizabeth was the barrier, the ultimate end and thought of every scheme of Mary's.

We have already alluded to the examination of Mary's letters to Bothwell. Our limits forbid our entering into the really interesting details of their production. All the astutest wits of the two kingdoms were engaged on this question. It was an encounter of wits, and all parties, it must be admitted, showed more cleverness than honesty;—Mary and her commissioners scheming, promising, negotiating, to prevent their being produced,—Murray and his party, alive to the advantages which might accrue to them by acceding to this wish, wise, cautious, guarded, alert,—Elizabeth and her ministers, on whom Mignet heaps an endless amount of virtuous vituperation, more than a match for both parties, and selfishly alive to the advantages to be derived to her cause by bringing them to the light. All those who are most lavish of abuse on Elizabeth, are candid at least in the admission of the extreme difficulty and peril of her situation. It must never be forgotten that Mary had asserted her right to the throne of England, and that there were foreign powers to support her right at any fitting opportunity. France and Spain only needed a favourable moment on their side, or a crisis in English affairs, to interpose in the Catholic cause. It was only Elizabeth's matchless genius and vigilance which preserved her country from such a crisis. What, then, was to be done with Mary? She could not be sent back to Scotland without an army to support her cause, and surely none who believes in Mary's guilt requires this from Elizabeth's generosity. And if she had been permitted to retire to France, it was giving the party most opposed to Elizabeth on religious grounds a weapon of which persons perhaps hardly realize the importance. Mary's gifts of person and mind also made her all the more formidable. Elizabeth, on her arrival in England, had sent envoys to receive her, whose report of the beautiful fugitive was somewhat of the same character and import as that of the spies of old times: 'We found her,' they said, 'in her answers to 'have an eloquent tongue and a discreet head; and it seemeth 'by her doings that she hath strict courage and liberal heart 'joined thereto.' This was an alarming account of the woman who had asserted superior claims against her, and whom she

Digitized by Google

knew to be wicked and unscrupulous in a desperate degree. She must have known, as we all know, that Mary was not to be believed or trusted. M. Mignet is absurdly indignant against Elizabeth for refusing to see Mary till her character was cleared. 'When the envoys,' he says, 'had informed her '(Mary) of the hypocritical regret and offensive refusal of their 'mistress, Mary Stuart, with tears in her eyes, sorrowfully 'complained,' &c.; but in this our queen was certainly justified, and it cannot he denied that it was of importance to Elizabeth to have the guilt she fully believed in proved against her rival. This point, which it was more her interest to attain than even Murray's, she brought about as far as suited her purpose, though her respect for royalty prevented her publicly pronouncing the judgment arrived at. And having put some of the leading Roman Catholic lords on her commission, she secured that they should be aware of Mary's true character. Had Mary not been what she was, we do not believe Elizabeth would have detained her a prisoner. We are not justifying her for thus constituting herself her judge, but all must see that it is a different degree of error to oppress an innocent person and a guilty one. Elizabeth kept Mary prisoner because it suited her interest—because she dare not let her go. But while she probably knew in her heart that *she* had no right to do this, she could take comfort at least in the conviction that Mary deserved it.

Amongst those convinced of the authenticity of the letters was the Duke of Norfolk, though ambition afterwards so far overcame all decency of feeling that he would have married Mary, as he did rebel for her, and was one of the many victims in her cause. Elizabeth had very early charged him with the projected marriage, when 'he did with great oaths deny it, and added, Why 'should I seek to marry so wicked a woman, such a notorious 'adultress and murderess? I love to sleep upon a safe pillow.... 'Besides, knowing as I do, that she pretendeth a title to the 'present possession of your majesty's crown, if I were about to 'marry her, your majesty might justly charge me with seeking 'to take your own crown from off your head.' In spite of these professions, in less than three years we find him reviving the plan of marriage, organizing with the Roman Catholic party a general insurrection, and 'plotting on the continent with the 'pope and the King of Spain to change the religion and over-'throw the government.' He was found guilty, and previously to his execution spoke with great bitterness of the syren who had led him to his present misery.

'He sayeth very earnestly with vow to God, that if he were offered to have that woman in marriage, to chose that or death, he had rather take this

Digitized by Google

death that he is going to, a hundred parts: and he takes his Saviour to witness of this. He sayeth that nothing that anybody goeth about for her prospereth, nor that else she doth herself; and also that she is openly defamed.'—*Letter from Henry Skipwith to Dr. Burghley, 16th Feb.* 1572. *Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 159.

In spite of the tears Mary wept for Norfolk, we believe he was more sincerely lamented by the queen he conspired against. She most unwillingly suffered his execution. She could not sleep while the question was pending, and wrote bitterly to Mary for having seduced him from his allegiance. His treason being manifest, the House of Commons and her ministers urged his death, and even ventured to demand that of Mary, her life being, they said, incompatible with the safety of the kingdom; they said that the axe must be laid at the root of the tree, but Elizabeth replied, 'She could not put to death the bird which to 'escape the pursuit of the hawk had fled to her feet for pro-'tection.' So Norfolk died; and Mary lived to 'betray more men.'

Foreign archives reveal how great had been Elizabeth's danger in the recent conspiracy. The rebels were in communication with Alva, the King of Spain, and the pope; the object being to restore the Roman Catholic religion in England. Norfolk and Mary had asked for arms, ammunition, money, and an army of ten thousand men. Recent discoveries have brought to light a long letter of twenty pages from Alva to Philip on this subject, in which he enters warmly into the plan, but is afraid of Elizabeth's vigilance, and suggests her assassination under the following significant form; 'If the Queen of England 'should die either *a natural death or any other death*, or if her 'person should be seized without your Majesty's concurrence, 'then I should perceive no further difficulty.' Ridolfi, the messenger of the conspirators, is also charged with letters to the pope, and is the bearer of letters from him to Philip, earnestly entreating Spanish intervention in the plot.

'On the 7th of July, Ridolfi was questioned at the Escurial regarding the enterprise which he had come to propose by the Duke of Feria, whom Philip had deputed to hear his statements. His answers were written down in the handwriting of Zayas, the secretary of state. It was proposed to murder Queen Elizabeth. Ridolfi said that the blow could not be struck in London, because that city was the stronghold of heresy; but while she was travelling; and that a person named James Graffs had undertaken the office. On the same day, the council of state commenced its deliberations upon the proposed assassination of Elizabeth, and conquest of England. The subject of the discussion was, whether it behoved the King of Spain to agree with the conspirators "to kill or capture the Queen of England," in order to prevent her from marrying the Duke of Anjou, and putting to death the Queen of Scotland; whether the blow should be struck while she was travelling, or, which would be easier still, *when she was at the country-house of one of the conspirators*, who had surrounded her with persons on

whom they could depend; and whether they ought not to be assisted in case they carried out their intentions, which they would not do without the orders of the Catholic King. The councillors of state severally gave their opinions, which were committed to writing, and have been preserved to this day. The Duke of Feria spoke first. "Under present circumstances," he said, "the affair is embarrassing, but the Catholic King must not postpone it. The Queen of Scotland is *the true heir* to the realm of England, and she will rightly discharge the duties of religion and friendship towards us. If we allow her to be crushed, we entail destruction on all those that are devoted to her. The proximity of the Duke of Alva greatly facilitates the matter, and not an instant must be lost if we intend to engage in the enterprise." '—*Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 144, from the *Archives of Simancas Inghilterra*, fol. 823.

The Duke of Feria, who gives this unscrupulous counsel, had been engaged in very different relations towards Elizabeth, as he was the ambassador chosen by Philip to offer his hand to her on her accession to the English throne. All the council gave their different suggestions. The Inquisitor-General voted that the sum of 200,000 crowns should be placed in Alva's hands, and that he should proceed in conformity with the declaration made by the pope's bull; he added that Ciapino Vitelli had offered to go in person with a dozen or fifteen resolute men to seize the Queen of England in one of her pleasure-houses, and that he would present himself before her under the pretext of demanding justice; but the Duke of Feria, profiting by his English experience, did not think it would be easy for a dozen men to capture the Queen of England. How extraordinary these deliberations sound in our ears! how strange that they should exist to this day to convict the authors of them! how wonderfully was Elizabeth's life hedged about and defended from the mischief that walketh in darkness! Mary and Elizabeth were both bold women, but if we must admire the natural virtue of courage, we admire it much the most in Elizabeth. It is impossible to contemplate her situation,—the dangers open and concealed by which she was surrounded throughout her reign, and which her wise and vigilant nature kept her constantly conscious of,—and not be affected and stirred by her lion-like bearing and invincible resolution. What a train of secret treasons and open aggressions does not her history lay before us, from the vacillating treachery of Norfolk, the interminable plots of Mary, the atrocious deliberations of Spain, down to the last mighty effort of her enemies against her. It is in contrasting her with these enemies that we see her greatness; and in comparing her with Philip, or the pope, or Charles, or Mary, we are tempted to forget her many not easily forgotten faults; and for a moment she stands as nobly distinct and magnanimous as when her poet's fancy drew her the

'Fair vestal thronèd in the West.'

Digitized by Google

All these detestable deliberations preceded but a little while the massacre of S. Bartholomew, which might well infuse a universal suspicion on the great acknowledged heads of the Roman Catholic cause. It decided Elizabeth to detain Mary in perpetual captivity. The two Houses of Parliament went further in their 'hatred and fanaticism,' and wished to proceed against her by a bill of attainder, which Elizabeth suppressed by proroguing parliament. But a commission was sent down to Mary to interrogate her on the Norfolk conspiracy. 'The answers,' says Mignet, 'were more prudent than sincere;' the nearest approach to a censure of her habits of unscrupulous falsehood that we can remember to have met with in his work. However, he is at one time ashamed for his heroine: when, finding all other means fail, and her spirit really subdued by loss of adherents, stricter confinement, and the failure of plots, she begins to flatter Elizabeth, and makes pretty knick-knacks for her; employing her uncle, the cardinal, to send little articles of *vertú* from France which might please the English queen, and busying herself in ordering gold lace and silver spangles to make a head-dress for Elizabeth, which she is overjoyed at her accepting. Mary must be doing something for her cause, and she knew that when anything new occurred, these delicate attentions need not stand in the way of more congenial designs; accordingly, on turning over a page or two, we find her deep in new negotiations with Philip, who must have been a very provoking ally,—so slow and ponderous in his movements, promising much, ready to listen to all propositions, but spoiling all by delay. This new negotiation is remarkable for the use she made of her son, to which we call the reader's attention, not because they resulted in anything, but as bearing upon one of the most impressive scenes previous to her execution.

'He (Philip) would not suffer himself to be tempted by the offer which Mary Stuart made to place her son in his hands, and which was somewhat difficult of realization, although she continually recurred to it. Nor was this the only offer she made: after having proposed to place her son, as a hostage for Catholicism, in the hands of Philip II., Mary Stuart went so far as to contemplate his disinheritance by the transfer of all her rights to the powerful defender of her religion in Europe. Her frequent attacks of illness, the dangers which beset her captivity, and the consequences which might result from her plots, led her to project a will containing the following clause, which, though doubtless very Catholic, is certainly very unmaternal, and quite as unmonarchical. "In order," she says, "not to contravene the glory, honour, and preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church, in which I wish to live and die, if the Prince of Scotland, my son, shall be brought back to its creed in spite of the bad education he has received, to my great regret, in the heresy of Calvin, among my rebellious subjects, I leave him the sole and only heir of my kingdom of Scotland, and of the right which I justly claim to the crown of England and its dependent countries; but if, on the other hand, my said son continues to

live in the said heresy, I yield, and present, and transfer all my rights in England and elsewhere . . . to the Catholic King or to any of his relations whom he may please, with the advice and consent of his Holiness, and this I do not only because I perceive him to be now the only true supporter of the Catholic religion, but also out of gratitude for the many favours which I and my friends, recommended by me, have received from him." '—*Mignet*, vol. ii. p. 198. *Labanoff*, vol. iv. p. 354.

This will was written in February, 1577. Now we find her in the pathetic scene which preceded her death, on the very way to the scaffold,—that occasion on which so much of the interest in her character is founded,—expressing herself to Melvil in the following words:—

' Bear these tidings that I die firm in my religion, a true Catholic, a true Scotchwoman, a true Frenchwoman. May God forgive those who have sought my death! The Judge of the secret thoughts and actions of men knows that I have always desired the union of Scotland and England. Commend me to my son, and tell him that I have never done anything that could prejudice the welfare of the kingdom, *or his quality as king*, nor derogated in any respect from our sovereign prerogative.' — *Mignet*, vol ii. p. 360.

She was false to the last. Our space fails us, nor yet is it needful to enter into the endless train of plots which the peculiar circumstances of the time engendered. The Roman Catholic party in England, oppressed and kept down, were ready to enter into any scheme. The Jesuits in the foreign seminaries were as unscrupulous in the means they sanctioned as their worst enemies could assert them to be. Philip had money for all Elizabeth's enemies, and had a host of pensioners. Bigotry and treason supplied men willing to take the active part in assassination. Mary, under the strict surveillance of Sir Amias Paulet, could no longer plot with them as freely as before, but her willingness to fall in with the most desperate measures was perfectly understood. But while the science of plotting and conspiracy was thus developed, Elizabeth's ministers on their side were growing still more skilful in the arts of detection, and very mean arts indeed they often were, and what in the present system of division of labour would be held very derogatory to the character of a gentleman. Though in these purer days we venture to guess that men in office are not curious to inquire *how* intelligence is gained, and criminals brought to justice.

In Elizabeth's time her ministers were their own police, and seem to have felt a genuine relish for unearthing a conspiracy, outwitting plotters, and counter-plotting, to make them convict themselves. They were weary of Mary, the whole of Protestant England desired her death—they verily believed her deserving of it, and felt that neither Elizabeth's nor their own lives were safe while she lived. Under these circum-

stances did Walsingham make the use he did of Babington, Ballard, Morgan, and the rest, and allowed Mary again such apparent liberty of action as to be able to enter into the plot they had formed; and by means of a double-dyed traitor, Gifford, she was entrapped into a correspondence with the conspirators, in which she warmly entered into a Spanish invasion, and renewed her promise to make Philip her heir; and upon Babington communicating to her the scheme for Elizabeth's assassination, she gave it her consent. Every letter she wrote or received had passed under Walsingham's eyes, who seems to have had no scruples or repugnance to the means he employed or the agents he worked by. We must regard such devices with abhorrence, but our censures of Walsingham are no sort of exculpation of Mary. She was a free agent, and voluntarily wrote what was brought as proof of her complicity in the plot. She had no scruples in doing so; we can hardly expect her to have them, when Philip, without her provocations, so warmly entered into the scheme, extremely commending Mary for having subordinated her love for her son to the service of God and of Christendom, and regarded the six gentlemen who were to murder Elizabeth as under the protection of God. As soon as the conspiracy was ripe, Walsingham laid before the Queen the plans for the invasion of her kingdom and her own assassination, which he justly thought likely means to bring her to the desired point; the suddenness, the wide extent of the plot, her own imminent peril and that of her country did produce fear, and altered her purposes, and in some way her state of feeling towards Mary. Elizabeth, on the question of the trial, the sentence, and the part which then fell on herself, and which she could not evade,—the signing of the death-warrant,—showed unequivocal dissimulation, a dissimulation which we despise. But this is not incompatible with true feeling, and may often be seen working with it. All her prejudices were against putting a queen to death; her principles were on one side, her personal danger and what she might well plead as necessity on the other; and while she wished to be rid of Mary, she very sincerely detested having to do it. Vacillating counsels constantly look like dissembling, but it seems certain that her ministers were really afraid of not being able to bring her to the point, and braved her displeasure at the last with an air of being more really apprehensive than subsequent writers upon the event seem to realize. Elizabeth was not sanguinary; compared with her times and with the example of her fellow-sovereigns, she was even merciful, and frequently showed a very remarkable forbearance towards her enemies, and a magnanimity for which she does not get sufficient praise. As an instance, Mary at one

time in a fit of passion wrote an insulting letter to Elizabeth, incompatible we should say with any delicacy, not to say decency of mind, pretending to repeat a number of gross slanders uttered against Elizabeth by the Countess of Shrewsbury. There is no doubt about the genuineness of the letter, Labanoff has seen it and vouches for this; but he and M. Mignet think it probable that the letter never reached Elizabeth, for no other reason that we can see but that she never took any notice of it or avenged it, as it was in her power to do. But our concern is with Mary, not with that strange compound of great and little qualities,—of what is admirable and (must we say) despicable?—of magnaminity, tinctured, as Hume expresses it, with 'malignity,'—of genius, wisdom, prudence, penetration, foresight, vanity, and coquetry, our English queen; who, however far we must abate our admiration and temper our respect with opposing sentiments, must yet be acknowledged for one of the greatest women, and beyond this, one of the greatest sovereigns that ever lived.

The history of Mary's death, when considered in relation to her life, is very remarkable. Doubtless she conducted herself with great grandeur, with an undaunted courage, and what is more, with seeming Christian resignation. Her last hours were calculated to make a great impression on all who witnessed them. But yet we are forced to the conviction that it was a scene, that she was consciously *acting* before the present spectators, and before posterity, for to the very last she was asserting with every circumstance of solemnity, things that were not *true*, in regard both to her son and to Elizabeth. It was probably impossible for bystanders not to believe her in that solemn hour,—at least, those who interrupted the awful pageant with their mistimed doubts, get set down for brutal fanatics—witnessing her dignified composure, her unshaken courage, her religious deportment; but irrefragable evidence proves that what she so emphatically denied was yet true—that with an unflinching constancy, for no other purpose but to sustain her credit and to die grandly, she was false to the last—that she entered the presence of God with a lie in her right hand. It is startling to write such things, it is terrible to believe them, but history leaves us no other course. M. Mignet, who details with enthusiastic admiration Mary's last hours, has by the whole tenor of his previous facts taught his readers to shudder where he himself sees ground for reverence and the most excited praise. Such courage, such constancy in the very face of death, were genuine. It is evident that she thought herself a martyr, that she believed she died in God's favour and for His cause, and yet the wicked habit of her life stuck to her. Truth and purity had never been any part of her religion, her

moral sense, tainted at its source, was utterly depraved. She did not know God as a hater of evil. The Church for which she thought she died was—*as she had known it* from her cradle to her grave—evil and corrupt, She had been inured to see its wickedness in high places—she knew it under no better aspect. She was the martyr, not of the Church Catholic, nor yet of the Church of Rome, but of its corruptions. It was those corruptions which misled her through life, it was those corruptions which held back remorse and terror at her death, and enabled her to die as she had lived, dauntless and heroical in a bad cause.

Such then was Mary; brave, high-spirited, princely, full of talent and intellect, radiant with beauty and grace; blessed too with an even temper, a happy disposition, a freedom from petty weaknesses and foibles, and gifted with all companionable and social qualities—but heartless and unprincipled, and, as her whole life shows, living, acting, hoping, joying, grieving, plotting, sinning, for *self* alone.

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—1. *The Law of Pews in Churches, &c. By* G. H. H. OLIPHANT, ESQ. *Barrister-at-law.* London: Longman & Co. 1850.

2. *Church Pews, their Origin and Legal Incidents, with some Observations on the Propriety of abolishing them. By* JOHN COKE FOWLER, ESQ. *Barrister-at-law.* London: Rivingtons. 1844.

3. *The Pew System the chief Hindrance of the Church's Work in Towns. A Sermon by the Rev.* EDWARD STUART, M. A. London: Masters. 1852.

IF much has been said and written upon any theoretical principles, be they good or bad, the advocates of those principles would do well to keep in view some external index, such as circumstances will never fail to give them, of the manner in which their influence is gaining ground. This external index is afforded, in Church matters, by the material buildings in which Churchpeople assemble together to exercise their common offices of religion, and by the arrangements which are then and there observed. Of architecture, as symbolizing the principles of the Church, in hewing out of earth's deep and awful caverns the glorious temples of the living God, as creating some foretaste of nature's own redemption; or of that inspired wisdom by which God's will may be done in earth, after some sort, as it is in Heaven, through means of a certain exquisite harmony and beauty in which nature cooperates with man in the praises and in the work of our common Maker; of Christian art, in short, we mean to speak but little: it is to the practical arrangements of plain men and women when occupied in public religious offices, that we would now call the attention of our readers. This is the substance, we must always bear in mind, which it is the province of art to adorn; nay, even, in the first instance, of bare walls to shelter and protect, if beauty cannot be consulted. Christians may worship and have worshipped under the open sky; the running stream was the font of early converts; the desert has been the scene of Christian eloquence in its turn, as have aisles and naves of sculptured stone; caves and holes of the earth have witnessed the highest mysteries of our religion, in common with that type of the heavenly Jerusalem which the Christian sanctuary may represent to our outward senses. It is not, then, of architecture, which shuts out the world and suspends a hallow-

Digitized by Google

ing canopy over the sacred work of God's service; it is not of painting and sculpture, that remind the assembly of God's people of the glory of heaven, and that teach them of Christian truths; it is not of music, that unites and refines and spiritualizes the expressions of assembled prayer and service; it is not of ascending incense, that betokens the oblations of our hearts' devotion, and the sweet perfume with which heaven envelops the performance of its own work; it is not of these adornments, which divers branches of the Church have more or less adopted as the accompaniments of Christian worship, but it is of the rude mass which preceded all these in point of time, and which now precedes them in importance,—it is of the assembly of people themselves that we would now speak, supposing them met together on free and open ground in the primitive and patriarchal simplicity of divine worship. There is a pleasure in the thought of personal freedom on which much of our peace of mind or power of concentrated attention must ever depend. The open air and common ground is the normal type and natural image of this freedom; and now that the joke of *Lydian worship* has had its sway, we must be excused for sympathising in some sort with its noble propounder, in using such a well-authorized figure to express his yearning after a mode of service that was free from certain things which he felt to be restrictions to his soul's free action. This our sympathy is also in common with a lower order of creation than the above-named object, for our own feeling in many churches, is to desire the fair and open banks of a river, resting on the smooth and verdant turf, as eagerly as the panting sheep immured in the pens of Smithfield. Our sympathy, indeed, is more closely connected with these latter objects, for it is not a desire that any of our brethren should, as it were, be shorn of their white garments; it is not our dread of surpliced priests, but it is our natural and personal dislike to be knocked about at the mercy of others, and to be shut up in pens or pews, without any choice on our part, unless we madly rush forth and forfeit the whole object in view; we like not to be stuck up, classed, and registered, according to our sleekness or our poverty, for two or three mortal hours. We do not mean that a certain restriction of personal liberty is to be avoided, for it necessarily occurs in any mutual arrangements between men and men: but our immediate object in suggesting this pastoral simile, is to realize the normal idea of a congregation with its pastor, before any artificial methods of order have been established, or even any conveniences have been developed. We wish to start afresh, as it were, and would be repelled by the evils and abuses of existing practices to the very origin and essential elements of Christian worship, alike free from the

Digitized by Google

proprieties of a higher state, and from the misuse of such laws and regulations as those proprieties required.

Let us picture then to ourselves, in the first place, an assembled congregation, without reference to any building whatever; no one can doubt that the ministrations of the Church would be valid, and, in Missionary labours, this is often witnessed as the real mode of operation till something else can be attained. From this commencement, then, we may trace what would obviously be the growth of such simple worship into a permanent institution. Conveniencies and adornments would naturally suggest themselves, but yet the original freedom would be witness of a principle which ought always to be retained. The Christian religion is essentially voluntary; 'Come unto Me' are the words of invitation, not of command, and the penalty of not coming is the loss of spiritual not of temporal advantages, except incidentally. The assembly, therefore, of Christians, is that of a voluntary coming to the representatives or ministers of Him who first used these words; it should be one of ready access and easy departure, unless by mutual understanding some private restraint is submitted to, for the public good. Individuals, then, would converge from their respective abodes to some centre where it was known that the teaching and the ministration, which they were willing to join, were to be going on. A crowd voluntarily met together on the common ground of intrinsic equality, feel this; though, if well-mannered, there will be deference shown towards individuals and classes. If this congregation listen to the teaching which they come to hear, they will learn gentleness and forbearance of temper, though individual responsibility and equality of interest will be found strongly urged. The natural laws, therefore, which regulate a crowd will be fixed, though private annoyances will be kept in check. They who have felt the spirit of that teaching, and learnt that some heavenly gift was held by commission in the hands of their instructors, will come again, and the congregation will then not be migratory or temporary, but that apostle of good tidings will be induced to remain, and his flock will gather round him habitually, acquiring thereby the bonds of a common family, from the rites which are administered as well as from the natural sympathy of being united in a common cause.

Another consideration, however, will now occur, which must draw our minds away from the idea of a mere crowd assembled to hear sermons or even to join in some acts of common prayer. The sacraments of the Church will obviously require a certain degree of reserve in their administration, which will prompt our imagined Missionary of the desert to desire a small covering or tabernacle wherein to minister the more sacred mysteries of his

Digitized by Google

religion, even though he still preached in the open air. Thus a chancel for himself and those immediately engaged in the direction of holy things will be the first building erected. The Bishop of New Zealand and his Missionaries celebrate the mysteries of the faith under a tent, the congregation being in the open air. The very nature of the offices thus performed will immediately suggest thus much of a covering, and this state of things would seem to correspond with the Apostolic era, when upper rooms were selected for the breaking of the bread, while other duties were performed as chance or opportunity enabled. Having now arrived at the stage of having a Sanctuary and Holy Place, the plain and the sky being still the floor and the roof of the nave, with trees to be the pillars and to form the aisles, it is obvious, in that natural settlement of ecclesiastical arrangements which we are depicting from its very elements, that the assembled people outside this chancel will also desire some protection from the heat or cold, the wind or rain, as the case may be. They will also desire a seclusion from others who have not joined their body, or who manifest in different degrees an hostility to their religion. As the habits of Christian devotion gain on them, they will also feel the benefit of retirement from the ordinary sights and sensations of the outer world. All these motives will prompt them to erect a covering over their assembly. Holding the assembly itself as the primary idea, we prefer saying, that they will erect a covering over themselves, to saying, they will make a building in which to assemble; for the natural disposition and order of the assembly, apart from the idea of any building whatever, is what we wish to refer to. Four plain walls, then, will be thrown up, with a roof of simplest construction, which will adjoin the before erected Sanctuary, the doors of which will probably be made of open work, that there may be direct communication between the two, though the place for general preaching will still be outside. According to one theory of the prevalence of pillars and arches in church architecture, these deviations from the simple walls we have described will be carrying out the resemblance to some avenue of trees, under whose shade the first meetings will have been held.

Supposing all this to have taken place on open and common ground, and also supposing that the law of the land subsequently not only sanctioned the whole proceeding, but identified itself with it, by considering it the act of the whole people of a certain district, and not only of a part, we have the entire system of a parish church at once before us as now recognised by law. The branch of the subject thus opened out to us, with which we are now concerned, has only to do with the disposition of the people

Digitized by Google

assembled in this church. The relations between the State and the management of the Church in other respects, we shall not touch upon, but confine ourselves to the question of that area, which the Church by the very title of nature considers to be common, open, and free; which freedom the law confirms and makes universal to all parish churches, as arising from the act of consecration, whatever the accidental origin of a church may have been in each place. All churches may have been founded by individuals on their own ground, but after the act of consecration, the law, in theory, considers it given to the Church, and exactly in the same position as the church we have pictured to have arisen on the wild desert, owned by none, the labour being performed as a common work.

The normal idea, therefore, of a church is, that of free and open ground for the use of the Christian community within each parish. All baptized Christians who have not been legally deprived of the rights thus belonging to them, as by excommunication, have a right to free admission, as all subjects have a right to walk on the highways. The law defines this right, even in exceptions of individual appropriation, to be of the nature of an easement; that is, not a property, but a right to use, or the privilege of a certain accommodation, as when one man may walk through another's ground, or may have a right of water not passing through his own land. Up to a certain point everything seems to establish this freedom and protect those members of the Christian community, who, owing to the accident of poverty, are not in a position to assert their rights, from being thrust aside. It is supposed that the church is every one's home, where he has a right to go, with ease and freedom, for Christian worship, subject only to such rules as must be established in any public institution for the common benefit of its members; nor, if this is really and truly the case with the inhabitants of the district or parish, will there be any fear lest strangers should be exposed to any unpleasant exclusion. They will share in the general freedom of the place within all reasonable limits, though, strictly speaking, the original open character of the church is a right of a local nature. The unity, however, of the Church, as composed of many local branches and interests, with the mutual interchange of rights and privileges naturally arising therefrom, is a distinct subject from what we need now consider. There is a certain claim, in justice and equity, which all have in churches of their own communion, though not parishioners, which is generally felt and acknowledged, and which it would be difficult to oppose in practice in such an open system as ought to be adopted towards parishioners, and which therefore we need not accurately define,

Digitized by Google

inasmuch as it is not the right which is principally endangered, or which is most important.

Certain rules we have acknowledged to be essential in the management of this assembly, even to make the best of this free and public right of all parishioners to the use of the church; and here it is that we come to the more intricate difficulties of the pew system. The law provides for these rules in an admirable manner according to its theory, but the precedents of years have so overloaded the original idea, that in too many places there exists the greatest difficulty in asserting it. The freehold of the church is placed in the Clergy, subject to certain laws by which to exercise the privileges of freehold. The church must be open during times of service, and generally for the rites of the Church. The parish priest on his part is also under compulsion to perform those rites. The church therefore is necessarily open. The same authority under which the parochial clergy hold their rights, viz. that of the Ordinary or Bishop, also appoints two officers, called churchwardens, to manage the placing in due order those who come into the building in accordance with their popular rights. They have to see that those who enter come for certain religious purposes, and if they misconduct themselves, they are making a use of the place to which their claim does not entitle them. They may therefore be ejected, just as a man who enters a field to walk on a public path is no longer in a secure position if he begins to dig up the soil; his right in the place is particular, not general. Public freedom, therefore, is no way interfered with by the power of the churchwardens, as long as people are properly engaged.

But now, having reached the point of finding our Church machinery admirably calculated in theory to preserve the elementary freedom which pertains to Christian worship, let us look, before we enter further into detail, at the state of things which, in process of time, grew out of this apparently well-balanced adjustment, and which even now is painfully visible in too many of our churches.

The office of Churchwardens, as representing the Ordinary, was to arrange people as they came into church, according to those principles which natural good taste, acting on the mass, would dictate, so that individuals would have to give up ill-regulated fancies to the general notions of propriety which prevailed over the congregation. The churchwardens, in fact, represented the good sense and experience of the whole, rather than enforced any arbitrary power, for we always bear in mind, that the Church never invites her flock in order to tyrannize over them. Now, good feeling in the mass will ever give a voluntary deference to position and station, and the courtesies

of life are not only encouraged, but highly developed by the whole theory of the Church, and that consistently with an equal development of the doctrine of Christian equality. This voluntary deference was entrusted for its execution to the officers of the Church, who were charged to place men according to their station. So far all is natural and fair, for it is to be presumed that these officers were not only to respect rank and station, but generally were to represent courtesy and good manners; and that, therefore, women, the aged, and infirm, such as the deaf, would be marked out as objects of peculiar consideration. No theory, however, will work without the guidance of a living principle within the sphere of its supposed operation. You may balance a thing as nicely as you like, but there must be some solid foundation, or some innate spirit of buoyancy always kept up, or the balance will be lost. In proportion, therefore, as the Church lost some portion of her true Catholic theory, or lost spiritual vitality, so, in the order of things, may we expect that the well-balanced system of Church arrangements would incline to one side or other, influenced by some worldly attraction, or disturbed by some hostile force. In other words, we may always expect that selfishness and avarice will supplant courtesy and openness of heart, if not suppressed by a constant struggle. The outward system of the Church does not pretend to have a mystical power of going on quietly and orderly, without a corresponding vitality of spirit; it is rather the fruit and token of that vitality; as we have presumed in ascribing the origin of ecclesiastical arrangements to the working of natural principle; common sense and courtesy taking as their premises the truths of revelation, conscious also of the continual guidance of the Spirit consecrating all such means. This injunction, therefore, to the officers of the Church, to place people according to their station, harmless in its first intention, and consistent with the original freedom of Christian worship, though still touching on very tender ground, became a great power for evil, when popular ideas of the use of a Church were somewhat altered, and deadness prevailed over too many of her offices.

The history of church-sittings is thus briefly summed up by Mr. Oliphant:—

'In our cathedrals, and other ancient ecclesiastical edifices, there seems to have been an entire absence of any fixed and regularly constructed accommodation for the laity, as an essential part of the building. For, before the Reformation, no seats were allowed, nor any distinct apartment in the church assigned to distinct inhabitants, except for some very great persons.

'The first seats permitted to be used were moveable forms, for the ease of the parishioners, to sit during those parts of the service, for which kneeling or standing were not directed by the ritual of the times. These

Digitized by Google

moveable seats were the property of the Incumbent, and in all respects at his disposal; and they were frequently bequeathed by incumbents to their successors, or others, as they thought fit. The Common Law books of an early period mention but two or three cases upon this subject, and those relating to the chancels and seats of persons of great quality.

'In later times, however, pews have been usually provided, as conducing to more undivided attention, and affording a point of union and mutual good example among individuals of families, so that they are probably an assistance to the devotions of the occupiers.'—*Law of Pews*, pp. 2, 3.

Archæologists would remind this writer of the stone bench surrounding the whole church, which is of so frequent occurrence in our old churches; and he has certainly transgressed somewhat the strict limits of his profession, when he ventured on an opinion as to the devotional, or social, effect of pews. That pews were not esteemed an unmixed good even on their first introduction, we have the witness of Dr. Corbett, Bishop of Norwich, who in 1622 thus writes to his clergy:—

'"Stately pews are now become tabernacles with rings and curtains to them. There wants nothing but beds to hear the word of God on: we have casements, locks, and keys, and cushions, and for those we love the church. I will not guess what is done within them: who sits, stands, or lies asleep at prayers, communion, &c.; but this I dare say, they are either to hide some vice, or to proclaim one; to hide disorder, or to proclaim pride." So in the orders and directions of Bishop Wren, issued in the Diocese of Norwich in 1636, it is directed "that no pews be made over high, so that they which be in them cannot be seen how they behave themselves, or the prospect of the church or chancel be hindered; and therefore that all pews which do much exceed a yard in height, be taken down near to that scantling."'

The above passage we extract from Mr. Fowler's very able and interesting little treatise on our present subject of pews. In tracing the growth of pews, he first considers the origin of that word. Dr. Johnson defines it, 'an enclosed seat in a church,' and its probable derivation is from the Dutch word 'puye,' signifying an enclosed balcony from which to speak, from the Latin *podium*, a place next the orchestra, where great people sat. It was used for the place where the service was read, and also for that enclosure which the lords of the manor were the first to erect in church for their accommodation. The general idea connected with the derivation of the word is, that of an enclosure of rather a conspicuous character, as Milton talks of sheep in their 'pues' in Smithfield, meaning the pens where they were exposed for sale. The able paper published by the Cambridge Camden Society some years ago, and to which mainly is to be attributed the distaste into which 'pues' have fallen, it is scarcely necessary to recall to our readers. The following is a comprehensive and interesting account of the supposed history of pews, from Mr. Fowler—

Digitized by Google

'Persons who have visited Roman Catholic countries, can easily imagine that this would be the case so long as England formed part of the Romish communion. For whatever may be the errors and corruptions of that Church, respect of persons within the walls of her sacred buildings, and indulgence of personal ease and accommodation there, are certainly not to be laid to her charge. The services of that Church indeed make accommodation for *sitting* of much less consequence to her members than to ourselves. Chaunting and prayer, with short selections from the Scripture, form the chief features of those services; and accordingly Roman Catholic congregations will be generally observed to be either standing or kneeling. Nor was the practice of preaching lengthy sermons, or rather (as it should now be called) of reading long essays, so much in vogue as it was afterwards under the reign of the Puritans, who carried it to a ludicrous extent, or as it is at present in a more moderate degree amongst ourselves. Under these circumstances, therefore, we should not expect to find general and luxurious accommodation for *sitting* in the early English churches, even if there were nothing but mere conjecture to rely upon.

'The most probable account is, that the exclusive appropriation of seats was *gradually* brought into fashion. The origin of English parish-churches was, speaking generally, the erection of an edifice by the feudal lord of a manor on his own property, for the benefit of his own family and his tenants, and the subsequent annexation of the tithes of that district to the church which he had built. Many founders of churches would probably reserve some part of the floor for the use of themselves, their families, and their successors; or if not, yet in the time which elapsed between the foundation of most of our churches and the Reformation, it was natural that the same pride and exclusive feelings which have served to perpetuate pews, should have suggested to their successors, sooner or later, to obtain for themselves a grant or licence of appropriation of some distinct portion of the church. Many years might again elapse before any one would presume to solicit a similar distinction. But in proportion as the awe of feudal dignity faded away, and growing commerce swelled the wealth and importance of other classes, and the property of ancient families began to be transferred to other hands, so the acquisition of Church privileges was extended, and other influential families were allowed occasionally to appropriate new portions of the floor. So that about the period of the Reformation, a parish-church would probably have presented the appearance of a floor partially covered with moveable seats, open benches, chairs or stools, with here and there one or more detached pews appropriated to the principal parishioners. Then the Reformation, with its lengthened services, and sermons, rendered accommodation for sitting of much more importance than before, and pews became rather more common than before: by-and-by the old open seats and chairs required reparation or renewal; and when a general new seating was determined upon, the privileges of the pew were imitated throughout, and the old fashion of moveable or open seats almost entirely discarded.'—*Church Pews*, pp. 7—10.

The progress of this evil is easy enough to imagine. Selfishness and pride made the possession of a church pew a matter of personal dignity. The authorities of the Church sanctioned this by the odious system of faculties, and where these were not granted, the law, which judges by precedent rather than by abstract right, supposed that long use implied a faculty, and called this a prescriptive right. Sales and bartering then followed; the original freedom and equality of a church was

Digitized by Google

altogether lost; the poor were left to feel their poverty more acutely in church than anywhere else; in town congregations the rich possessed the whole space of the church, and the poor got quite out of the habit of looking on the church as their own; those who went found themselves in back parts, and seated in places which marked their low estate very strikingly. They were unable to enjoy any sense of freedom, and could not choose any position according to their necessities or infirmities. They were put to a very unfair test in the matter of going to church, as compared with the rich. To the latter it was a positive sign and mark of rank, an opportunity of display, a gratification to their pride, while to the former it was quite the reverse. It is not, therefore, just to compare the habits of different classes of people in any matter which holds out these varied inducements; which attracts the one even on selfish principles, but requires a great exercise of humility in the other. To prove the operation of this state of things, we may refer to the habits of the poor in country places, where there are no gentry or influential tradesmen, except the squire and one or two farmers, to have absorbed the whole church to themselves. We there find the labourers generally very regular in attending church; whereas in towns the influence of the middle classes seems quite to have driven the poor away, and to have stamped the church with the ignoble title of the rich man's religion.

This state of things—for it is unnecessary further to describe what all so well know, and what is now an oft-told tale—is entirely, after the common principle of a gradual spoliation, sanctioned by law, according to the received necessity of making abstract right yield to the habits of a people and to a series of precedents. An original right is always supposed to lapse if possession has been held by other parties for a certain length of time. We do not say that this principle is unjust, for it is a necessary law of society, and it is futile to suppose that rights will continue in force, with no claimants, from generation to generation. Nor was that pure and spiritual duty of the Church, to protect the privileges of the poor, likely to be undertaken by the secular arm when forgotten by the Church herself. The Church must either do her work or lose her ground. If, for example, the Church makes no proper use of her revenues, of course, as by nature they are *ipso facto* made secular, so will the law in time establish that fact, and the Church will find herself spoiled of her inheritance outwardly as inwardly she had long been so.

In the case of churches this spoliation has gone to very great lengths, and the matter has been made more difficult to manage,

Digitized by Google

by modern legislation adopting quite a different theory in the establishment and building of new churches to that which we have pictured in tracing the inherent freedom of our old parish churches. Modern habits and abuses were legalized by being made to form the basis of a new system in district churches and chapels. Still, however, the distinction between the two was always recognised, and the freedom of a parish church has seldom been altogether swamped, so strongly is the principle fixed in the whole legal position of the Church. A parish Church, in which all the pews are rented, is rare. It was indeed a matter of necessity to make district churches dependent on rents, and thus to destroy their free character; not because it was an approved system, but because no one came forward with that self-sacrifice which is always a necessary element of more perfect systems. It is obvious, therefore, that unless we have the spirit of self-sacrifice which is necessary to form endowments, and to give the church, clergy and all, as it were, to the benefit of the cause of Christ, we must be content to pass over the evil of our pew-renting district churches. They may do good in their way, but they are not true churches according to the original type; they are only private associations to relieve the parish church by hiring an ecclesiastic to perform the public acts of religion to a select company, the proceeding being cleared of the charge of schism by special provisions and licences.

With all the difficulties and obstructions that cloud the pure free ideal of a Christian Church, that primeval element has yet, providentially, escaped far more than might have been feared. The fearful unchristian effects of the pew system have at all times stood in such bold contrast to the Gospel blessings on the poor, that advocates have never been wanting to maintain the true principle; and now that the Church is striving to be active in her work, it is marvellous to witness how abuses, which had hitherto been so long established as to form legal precedents, seem to crumble into dust before the obvious and clear light of justice and Christian truth. Yet this is but partial, and the freedom of Christian worship is sadly overlooked in many quarters where we might have hoped that this development of their other professed principles would have forced itself upon their notice.

The prejudices in favour of pews are not overcome, and architects now have to contend with the same feelings which obstructed Sir Christopher Wren, of whom it is said, that 'he considered 'it to be desirable that there should be no pews in churches, but 'only benches, and complained that there was no stemming the 'tide of profit and the advantage of the pew-openers.' No part of the Church movement that has been going on for the last twenty years has been so prolific of visible results as the improvement

Digitized by Google

in the arrangement of church sittings; and so far we ought to be thankful for this witness to the Christian truth we are now advocating, for we call it nothing less: yet there are many discouraging signs in some of the restorations even now in progress; and we fear there is still a great affection for pews and pew doors, though actual traffic in the church, we hope, has received its death-blow. In many churches lately restored, we have the architectural beauty of a better system; but the door is still allowed, not only to remain, but to be rebuilt, thus keeping up the great mark of the exclusive system, though slightly glossed over by being a little lower and having pretty carving upon it.

Nothing, to our minds, is so disappointing as to see this adoption of revived architecture, without the ideas that ought to go along with it. The only thought that can reconcile one to it is, that to a certain extent the Church is prepared for better things in future. It is singular to observe in how many new or restored churches everything is nice but some one or two points, which, to a correct eye, spoil the whole. This is often connected with the altar; but into this question we shall not enter. The reading-desk is another tender point on which depends much of the character which outward arrangements are able to stamp on the service. There is a new church in the parish of Hackney, really quite a model in most respects. It is nobly situated, the spire is very handsome, the interior very solemn, and the seats open; but in the midst of the church stands, elaborately carved, the offensive structure of pulpit, reading-desk, and clerk's desk; in fact, a regular old three-decker, in full sail westward.[1] This same part-revival of better things is often very apparent in what immediately comes under our present notice. Poppy-heads, with lions, dogs, griffins, with a vast number of mediæval devices, may be seen standing erect in solid oak; the whole area of the church, perhaps, may seem to bristle with luxuriant freedom, as symbolized by art; but yet, on further examination, all this is mere sham: there are nothing but exclusive old pews, after all, though not quite so high. It is really too bad to see the pretty details of architecture actually made use of for purposes so contrary to their true ideal as pew hinges and latches. Solid oak doors, with clumsy bolts and hinges, are very noisy concerns; and if doors are determined on, let them be simple,

[1] That this abomination has been introduced by a new Incumbent, and that it was entirely contrary to the known wishes and intentions of one who spent so much upon this church, the late Rector, Mr. Norris, it is only fair to state. But the crying evil is, that whatever ritual propriety, and at whatever cost, has been as it seems, secured to a church, authority is always ready to spoil and ruin the munificent and pious labours of the departed at the first summons of a conceited or ignorant successor.

Digitized by Google

light contrivances, with modern spring latches, made in such a manner as to show that they do not altogether harmonize with the rest, but are of a temporary nature. Far better, however, is it to have no doors at all; and in that respect, as well as in all others, let architecture be made expressive of its congenial ideas, and not be introduced as an unmeaning appendage to something quite different from its natural character.

We have implied that there seems to have been a slight pause in the pew agitation during the last few years. It is perhaps well that there should have been time to see how a practical subject of such a nature operates of its own force, unfostered by any unnatural agitation. At the first start of the Church movement, there was a justice so obvious in this department of its work, that many took it up kindly without reference to any other principle connected with it. It stood on its own merits, and produced an amazing change in more churches than is generally imagined, especially in rural districts. Since that, however, it has shared the odium of many other popular cries, and has been forced into doing so for selfish purposes. The cry of popery is a very convenient method of exciting a prejudice against anything whatever to which an individual has had a previous antipathy as being contrary to his own interests.

Having now considered the present state of the pew question as an historical subject up to within the last few years, we are anxious, in the next place, to draw attention to the actual working of open seats where they have been adopted. In doing this we have had recourse to the experience of several persons who have kindly aided us according to their several opportunities. The time required for collecting any great mass of evidence, together with the fact that an anonymous writer in a review has no claim to expect much trouble in his behalf, or much confidence from influential persons, must be our apology for not having a great show of statistics to offer. Many with whom we have corresponded have kindly volunteered to send their experience, but, from the press of other matters, and the difficulty perhaps which some feel in compressing a large and rather indefinite subject, we have not yet received their communications. We are, however, unwilling to defer the subject, and with our best thanks for the kind intentions of those for whom we are unable to wait, with apologies also for not so doing, we shall turn at once to those communications which have been so promptly forwarded. For these we express our sincerest gratitude to the writers, trusting that the use we are about to make of them will be in accordance with their wishes. We shall introduce no names, except, occasionally, those of places where the information afforded is free and open to all.

Digitized by Google

The plan we have adopted has been to forward a list of heads comprising such advantages as might be expected to result from open seats, in order to elicit confirmatory remarks or otherwise. It is fair to state that we have received answers of an unfavourable nature as well as the reverse; but where this has occurred, we have only been thereby reminded that the pew question does not stand alone, but that it is involved in many other kindred reforms without which the freedom of churches cannot effectually operate, as for instance, where it is complained that open seats do not bring in money so readily as pews. This we do not dispute, but as it is only the particular question of seats we have now to examine, we must concede, as indeed we have before done, that where there are no endowments and a clergyman is unable to run great risks, the necessity of the case must swamp the benefit we now advocate. Again, where open churches fail to attract the poor, we must not at once come to the conclusion that they are an unimportant element in the reformation of religious habits in those classes; for the services of the Church also require more adaptation to their powers and convenience than is generally the case before we can hope that they will be attracted, especially if we bear in mind the strength of habit, and the entire absence for many generations of any true popular feeling in large towns of the holiness of consecrated places.

We propose in the first place to lay before our readers each head, under which we endeavoured to elicit the advantages of open seats, with such direct testimony as we have already obtained to that particular proposition, reserving more general and unclassified remarks to follow after.

Our first proposition was as follows:—

'That open seats, even if appropriated, are more easily apportioned to the actual and varying wants of each household, and occasion less waste of room than is found by experience to be the case in the old pew system; and even where room is no object, enable the congregation to be more closely gathered together in the best parts of the church.'

The lay author of a very widely circulated and interesting little work, on the subject generally of reverence due to holy places, to whose courtesy we are greatly indebted, having paid much practical attention to church seats, both before writing that work, which was some years ago, and also since, now says,

'My views as to the appropriation of seats, since that work was written, are somewhat changed. From experience, I doubt whether *any* appropriation, however restricted, is desirable, or at all needful.'

The active and laborious clergyman of a large sea-port district, where a handsome new church has lately been built, thus gives his experience:—

Digitized by Google

'The seats in my church are *all free*, though by common consent persons who are in the habit of attending regularly find their way without molestation to their favourite sittings. Not only is room saved by this arrangement, but gas and trouble in cleaning, no unimportant items in churches where service is celebrated daily, as here. On ordinary week-day evenings we only light six burners, and on festivals, when there is a sermon, eight, and those in the best part of the church, so that the congregation is more closely gathered together. I have never found any difficulty in the way of the congregation seating themselves from the seats being open.'

To vary the scene we now turn to the testimony of a rector in a small rural parish of Wiltshire, in which the church has within the last few years been rebuilt with very great care as to all internal fittings. He thus writes in answer to our first proposition:—

'I see the truth of this every Sunday. Three seats in my church (for special reasons) have doors—low doors, it is true, but still doors. They are appropriated to three distinct families. One is constructed to hold seven persons, the others four each. In a morning, the average attendance in the three seats is five; in the afternoon, two. But though they are only allotted seats, held neither by faculty nor prescription, and the vacancies might therefore legally be occupied by other parties in case of stress of room, the *doors* appear to form an insuperable obstacle; and I see people crowded in other parts of the church, five into seats only constructed for four, while there is room to spare here. We have three other allotted seats without doors, which are not liable to this abuse to anything *like the same extent;* though certainly, the fact that they are allotted, is not without its deterring influence even here.'

The Incumbent of a country town, with a noble church lately restored from the worst abuses of the old system, under this head says:—

'There is certainly less waste of room with open seats than in the old square pew system; and there is a greater disposition, I think, to be accommodating to strangers.'

From the Clergyman of a new church in the suburb of a cathedral city, we thus hear:—

'There can be no doubt of the saving of room effected by the adoption of open seats; the poor, instead of being huddled into galleries, in the side aisles, and under the organ, may be thus placed in a favourable position to hear and see.'

A Clergyman of great influence, both from his position in the Church and in society, a most judicious observer of all that passes around him, and who has three churches in his parish, thus confirms this first proposition:—

'There can be no doubt that open seats, if appropriated, occasion less waste of room, and enable the congregation to gather together more closely. The advantage of this is great on week-days and Saints'-days.'

We heard, personally, from the Vicar of a country town, that he had found the truth of this by most vivid contrast in his church between the state of things before a late restoration and

Digitized by Google

since. He managed with some difficulty to avoid having doors erected, and finally prevailed, on the ground of saving money which might be devoted to a new heating apparatus. All are now well satisfied, the body of the church is fairly and evenly filled, though, from the strictness of the appropriating system, and the great number of the middle classes in the place, the poor were not benefited as he could have wished.

We add to the present division of our subject by the testimony of a layman, whose knowledge of different parts of the country, as a tourist and otherwise, and whose interest in the subject, together with a lively manner of narration, will doubtless make his communication very acceptable to our readers, especially when they bear in mind that the coming extract is but one of several which will be introduced under their proper headings:—

'So far as I have had experience of churches containing open seats, I can bear explicit testimony to the truth of this first proposition,—so far as regards open seats generally,—for I do not know many instances in which the open seats are appropriated; but these few are in no respects exceptions to the general rule. Weybridge, Surrey, is one of these. In the old church, where there were the old high pews, the congregation in the week were scattered here and there over the church, each one in his own pew; in the new church,—built where the old one, a wretched structure, was pulled down,—the seats are appropriated, but open, and the congregation now are "closely packed together in the best parts of the church." By means of the open seats, two great family pews were got rid of, one always empty, belonging to an extinct family; the second almost always empty, and never nearly full. Thus a great saving of room was effected, as no seats answering to these are found in the new church. The same remarks will apply to Thorpe Church in Surrey, where a pew that would hold sixteen was tenanted by one lady only, whose servants on one occasion actually left the church, not being able to find room elsewhere. In the same church there was a single pew which filled up nearly the whole of the south transept: when the church was arranged with open seats, this was removed, and four or five seats substituted, holding on the whole about twenty persons. In this church, also, the open seats were appropriated. In S. Mary's church, Kidderminster, there are a few appropriated open seats, which are found far preferable to the old pews, and many unappropriated. The practical advantage of these over the high pews, as collecting the congregation together, is clearly manifested in this church; for whenever any persons in possession of pews happen to attend the daily service, they resort to their pews in all parts of the church, whereas the rest of the congregation are gathered into one place. This will, probably, not be applicable to future times, as all of the pews remaining in the church are at this time either actually removed, or immediately to be so. In the mother church of a parish in Wiltshire there is a "private aisle" blocked up by a very large pew thrown across the arch, which fills up nearly half of the aisle, and makes the rest of it utterly inaccessible. This pew, when it is not kept locked, is sometimes occupied by the page belonging to a lady's household in the parish, who was placed there originally for the purpose of keeping out another family who wanted to use it. The whole aisle is therefore useless. Another large pew is empty regularly for half the year. This one would hold about twelve or fourteen persons. Although

Digitized by Google

on account of the prevalence of dissent in this parish, the church is unfortunately by no means straitened in room, the fact of the *waste* is equally undeniable. A few appropriated, and a good number of unappropriated open seats exist, and the effect of these is similar to that which I have mentioned with respect to Kidderminster. At Shepperton, in Middlesex, before the removal of the great pews, which was about seven years ago, evils of a similar nature abounded. The church is but small, certainly not larger than the parish requires, (especially as Shepperton is one of those few places in which there is not one dissenter;) indeed, the Rector would be glad to enlarge it if he could, and yet under the old system, fully one-third of the length on one side was swallowed up by two pews of unusual magnitude. In the larger of these two only two persons generally sat; occasionally there were others, but it was seldom or never anything like full. There were other pews which occupied far more of the church than was justified by the size of the households of the occupiers. Now these evils are removed, and the new seats, though to a considerable extent appropriated, from the circumstance of having low small doors, not in strictness *open* seats, are not the cause of any waste of room, or at the worst of very little.

'With respect to the extent of saving in room attained by the substitution of open seats for old pews, I cannot speak decidedly, not having examined a sufficient number of instances; but leaving out of the question those which are generally seated in an omnibus fashion, *i. e.* on both the long sides, and at least one of the short ones, I should think that the gain would be fully equal to one in six, probably rather more than less, taking the average width of both pews and open seats. Of course, in reseating any ordinary church, the proportion of gain over the whole area would probably be considerably more than this, as there would almost certainly be some one or more pews of more imposing dimensions than I have allowed for; one in five would be more near the mark.'

One case mentioned in this communication would seem not legitimately to further our argument, inasmuch as there are doors; we have not, however, excluded it, as in the contrast between the old and the new system, the present advantages are obviously derived from what is an approach to open pews, though we should have preferred seeing that principle literally and boldly developed.

Our second proposition was as follows:—

'2d.—That open seats, not appropriated by definite authority, do ultimately admit of a parochial congregation, quietly and orderly arranging themselves for service, without any serious inconvenience or evil results.'

Under this head our correspondents all say much the same thing, agreeing that there is no trouble in the arrangement of a congregation in perfectly open seats. Indeed, if any one fairly inquires whether the open or enclosed part of any particular church, he may be acquainted with, has been the cause of most trouble and ill feeling in the arrangement of a congregation, there is, we think, no doubt that the enclosed part will be found most guilty of misdemeanors. One whom we have before quoted, says: 'In the free seats, I find the people almost always 'occupying the same place without confusion, and, as far as I

Digitized by Google

'know, without dispute; though of course an irregular church-'goer will come in and occupy a seat which is generally in the 'tenancy of his more regular neighbour, and a momentary dis-'satisfaction may have been created at his having to turn out. 'But I have never known the dissatisfaction more than momen-'tary.' Another says: 'I find by a short experience in a new 'church and congregation, that they gradually, by common 'assent, set apart certain seats to themselves. I encourage 'this appropriation by regular attendants among the poor: 'there is no disorder at all in the matter.' Again: 'We find 'the portion of our open seats which is not appropriated, filled 'in a quiet and orderly manner; and that, too, long before the 'service commences.' One before referred to says: 'I built 'a church nine years ago, in which all the seats are open and 'free, and I have never known any one deprived of the seat he 'usually occupies, nor have I seen any inconvenience to result 'from it. The congregation arrange themselves very quietly, 'and there is far more courtesy manifested.'

In a church built about eight years since in a sea-port town, as far almost from the town before mentioned of that description, as east and west in our island can make it possible, there are open benches throughout calculated for more than a thousand; two hundred of these are appropriated, but the remainder are perfectly free. The clergyman emphatically assured us that he could testify most strongly to the truth of our present heading, judging from his constant observation. Our more general correspondent writes thus:—

'I have seen many manifest proofs of the truth of this proposition, but never met with any single instance which could legitimately be urged in contradiction to it. The congregation assemble and arrange themselves quietly and orderly; and in many cases those who are regular in their attendance always occupy one unchanging place, which seems to be assigned them by general assent of their neighbours, and left vacant for them as a matter of course by those who may come in earlier. It may be well to add to this statement, that I never met with any one who so far imagined that he had any *right* to such a seat, as to attempt to remove from it any one who might happen to have occupied it before his arrival; I am aware that such cases exist, but I speak of my own experience; the whole arrangement, so far as it was found to exist, being apparently produced simply by the courtesy and common sense of the congregation, who were aware that it would tend in its measure to produce order and quiet in the church. This perhaps would be practicable only in small parishes, or at least in places where the congregation was composed of nearly the same individuals from day to day; hence it arises that I have observed it more in the congregations attending daily prayer, than in the Sunday congregation, although the persons whom I have alluded to frequently retain the same seat on the Sunday that they do in the week. Kidderminster and —— are two cases very much in point, particularly the former, where the congregation being much larger than in the latter place, the practicability and convenience of this scheme of arrangement is more clearly set forth. The daily morning prayer was

Digitized by Google

usually attended while I was there, (*i.e.* for periods of three or four months at a time over a space of seven years,) by 70 or 100 persons, which is pretty well as times go; the evening prayer by about the same number, in the winter frequently by as many as 150 or from that to 200. Of the average congregation I should think 30 or 40 had their regular places; perhaps scarcely so many, but still a considerable proportion, and this certainly promoted the quiet and order of the church. Christ Church, Birmingham, is a good example of this second proposition; the body of this church is filled with open unappropriated seats; I believe the sides have pews, but I am not quite certain; (there are no *aisles*, as it is a modern Grecian affair, with no division between body and aisles except what the shafts supporting the galleries afford; and, though this has nothing to do with our immediate object further than to show this need not be looked on as a "party question"—it is the only church with which I am acquainted that is destitute of a font;) but certainly the congregation assemble themselves in a most regular and orderly manner, without any inconvenience at all. But to give full testimony to the truth of this proposition would be little else than to enumerate those churches which either in whole or in part contain open free seats, those being excepted where there are a few only, and they either thrust away under galleries, or hidden by large pews standing in front of them; I should be afraid to speak so much for these.'

Such then is found by experience to be the general benefit of open seats as regards the economy of room and the facility of arranging a congregation. To expect that free seats will draw large congregations, irrespective of other considerations, is of course unreasonable, in proof of which we may refer to that vast district of London called Bethnal Green. The new churches built there are, as far as sittings go, well constructed, though with some grievous faults of ecclesiastical propriety, not only in this respect, but in more important arrangements. It is a mysterious problem for the curious in social manners to solve, what becomes of the closely packed inhabitants of streets after streets in this part of London on their only day of rest. Persons best acquainted with their habits describe them as not badly off, for they are rather the better class of workmen; as being quiet and orderly so far as any political sentiments are involved in demonstrations of discontent; as not violently immoral or drunken, but as utterly regardless of any religious responsibility. The whole district is very uniform in character, consisting of streets, most of them recently and neatly built for the use of mechanics, with scarcely a house in the whole district adapted for the income of one hundred a-year. This kind of population on the Sunday, when all are released from their toil, might be pictured perhaps as turning out of their houses and filling the streets with noise and clamour expressive of unrestrained efforts after amusement; but these streets are perfectly quiet, as if most of the inhabitants were flown. The man indeed is seen, house after house, sitting in his shirt-sleeves reading the *Dispatch;* but that employment cannot

Digitized by Google

account for the general dearth of visible and youthful merriment. Where they all are we know not: some go to Victoria Park, but not in such numbers as to imply that it is a general resort; some extend their walks further, and some occupy the public houses with their gardens and different enticements to pass away the time. One thing, however, is certain, that lamentably few of the real working class are to be found in the churches provided for them; nor can dissent boast of any better success. It is not within our present subject to discuss any want of power which hampers the Church, as presented before these people for their religious edification; but there is a great lack of that unity or corporate character, that central strength, which should always be preserved as a type of the Church's very existence. If churches here and there are scattered about, void of any plain and obvious unity by which all are seen to be instruments of a great central idea, that idea not only being an abstract vision, but a visible and earthly system as much as the single church or clergyman immediately before them; if each church is left as it were in isolation, to take its chance among multitudes who have no conception of any particular claim on the part of the Church Catholic to their allegiance; it must be expected that they will share the fate of all other unprotected institutions; that disunion or even rivalry—witness the unhappy bickerings and under-selling in marriages among the clergy of this parish, which recently caused so much scandal—will spring up, and that, with the additional hindrance of great poverty in the external appointments of the churches, there will be a general want of dignity or greatness to command attention. If a clergyman is not seen to be acting as part of a living system, backed up in all he does by the whole momentum of that system, he is thrown back unfairly on his own individual powers of gaining popularity, and this, in the case before us, with very small means at his command.

But it may be said that the parochial system is the same there as elsewhere; that the Bishop of the diocese is as much the centre of the Church in Bethnal Green as in rural districts; yet this very mode of stating the case shows a nakedness in the Church's co-operation, as exhibited before an almost unchristian population. In rural districts it is not practically on the mere abstract existence of a Bishop that the poor and uneducated depend for the unity which is attached to the churches of each parish. The Church has a consolidated character from many associations and habits that come into their daily life. In Bethnal Green, however, the local antecedents have been very different. It is but a few years ago that the Church had no voice at all, as it were, in the manners of the people, from an

Digitized by Google

absolute dearth of churches or clergy. Thousands and thousands of men, women, and children, lived in small low houses, built back to back, with little plots of garden before each, in which bull-dogs or other animals, according to taste, were kept for Sunday recreation; the unfortunate cattle on this road to Smithfield being the hebdomadal objects of sport. A clergyman has informed us that, in his recollection as a boy, the streets of the whole district were given up to the amusement of bullock-baiting; that a wretched animal was separated from his fellows and chased from the helpless drovers as a sort of black-mail toll for the security of the rest. The recollection of our informant is much quickened as to the reality of this picture by himself having once been in very perilous proximity to the horns of an infuriated ox. Now, in planting Churches through a place like this, more demonstration of the Church's unity is required than the mere knowledge of episcopal superintendence over them all; this alone will not place the true character of the Church before the minds of the people. In early times all efforts at making a people Christian emanated from a central establishment, which in time became the full-blown cathedral or great church of the diocese; and no one can properly estimate the advantage which those very buildings have been of to our Church, in keeping up the central idea of unity through ages of indifference; the fact of S. Paul's Cathedral standing big and high in the centre of London, as a mother protecting her brood of smaller churches, has been a standing witness to the Church's consolidated character, which has taught an extensive lesson by a certain momentum, that derives its force from former times, and keeps it in spite of further impetus being almost stopped.

It is not for us to devise how this precedent might have been carried out in the case before us, but the lack of some solid foundation is a great hindrance to the Church in gaining influence over a fresh population; without this a church does not come before them with much greater appearance of authority than a dissenting meeting-house, and if that is the case it follows that the balance of attraction is to the latter, for it has more power of adaptation to popular taste, be that good or bad.

This digression from our immediate subject is admissible in order that our readers may comprehend a certain difference which we conceive to exist, in the general position of the Church through this district and elsewhere. The question, therefore, of open seats is not fairly tested by reference to such a field of operation; yet many of the advantages already enumerated cannot fail to be manifested, though large congregations are not thereby attracted. We have visited nearly all of the new churches, and can speak from observation that during the after-

Digitized by Google

noon services on Sunday the congregations are almost nominal; indeed, that it is only a matter of courtesy to use that expression to the few there assembled. In the evening they are larger, but in some cases they do not number more than a hundred even then. Few exceed two hundred, which is a small proportion of 7,000 supposed to be under the parochial care of each church. Those, however, who are present, seem well placed, and have the appearance of arranging themselves naturally and easily in the most convenient portions of the church, which avoids that aggravation of a small number afforded by a scattering into remote corners even of those few.

Under this branch of our subject we will introduce some useful examples of masses of people meeting together in an orderly manner, furnished by a layman resident in London :—

'That large bodies of people can assemble and occupy seats not appropriated to them without any confusion or disorder is found at the sermons known as the "May Sermons," when crowded congregations assemble as well in churches as in meeting-houses, and occupy the pews without regard to their ordinary appropriation.

'The large meeting at Exeter Hall and similar places, where a few seats only are reserved, and the rest are open to all comers, are instances of the same thing.

'There is a large chapel—the "City Road Chapel"—a central place of the Wesleyan Methodists; it is capable of holding, it is said, two thousand persons. Adjoining to it, and having an entrance from it, is a place called the "Morning Chapel," capable of holding perhaps some hundreds. It is very common after the principal preaching in the larger chapel to hold another meeting in the smaller one, which is on such occasions crowded by persons who have been present in the large one, but even this passage from the large place, where each has his own rented seat, to the small one, where each takes the first seat which pleases him, is effected without confusion.

'Of course, the ordinary assembling of a parochial congregation would be far less liable to confusion than any of the bodies above referred to.'

An instance of a similar kind has long been afforded in Ely Cathedral, where two congregations, one from the cathedral itself, and another from a neighbouring church, were regularly in the habit of assembling in the nave for the same sermon. Forms were arranged, and, of course without the smallest attempt at appropriation, which would have been impossible if desirable, all placed themselves with most perfect facility and mutual convenience. We do not know whether this practice continues, but it is a very good example, which we should like to see followed by all cathedrals, as far as preaching in the nave is concerned, apart from the whole Church Service in the same place.

We will now, however, proceed with the digest of our correspondence, under the head of dividing the sexes, as a help to the orderly arrangement of open seats. This is not a common practice, and therefore many who have written on other parts of

Digitized by Google

the subject are unable on this to give more than their views or their partial attempts, unsupported by any great experience.

One country correspondent says,—

'This is an arrangement I have carried out, and I have every reason to be satisfied with the results. It certainly economizes room. There may be a spare place in a seat, but a single woman coming in does not like to occupy it, if she has to crush past two or three men to get to it. Where the sexes are divided there is no such delicacy, nor need there be. The people fell naturally into the arrangement, and I have never heard a grumble about it. I should have wished, if possible, to carry it through the whole church. But I had some impracticable people to deal with, and in the appropriated seats it could not be done.'

Another says, 'The sexes are divided with good effect.'

Again, with regard to a new town church:—

'I have observed a certain voluntary separation of the sexes in the seats under the pulpit and reading-desk; the male (aged) attending generally on one side. I shall encourage this; but I doubt the advantage of directly enjoining it, though it is done so, I believe, in Lutheran churches abroad with good effect, and is an ancient and primitive custom.'

One, to whose practical wisdom we attach great value, says,—

'I think the division of the sexes an advantage. It is remarkable that without any hint from us, the congregation for the most part adopted this plan of their own accord. With very few exceptions the women sit on the south side and the men on the north; and I am not aware of any request having been made by any one, that they would so arrange themselves. I think that the persons who would be inclined to object are the middle classes, because they take their children with them to church, and they dislike the separation. The poor do not dislike it, but their children go to the school and sit with the school children. This may cause the difference of feeling.'

Under this head another remarks:—

'The division of the sexes would be no doubt a help in carrying out the orderly arrangement, but in many places the people are prejudiced against it. Families like to sit and worship together. I have attempted to indicate my feelings on the subject, by assigning seats for the male teachers of my Sunday School on the north side, and for the female on the south side of the church; and directing the verger, when strangers enter, to follow that plan in placing them. The same sides are adhered to in seating the children of our schools.'

Our lay tourist says:—

'The chief instance that I am acquainted with is Christ Church, Birmingham, mentioned under the last head; and here I have no doubt that the separation is the greatest possible help in promoting the orderly and quiet arrangement of the people. Knowing the general character of towns, I have very little hope that evil results can be effectually prevented in those localities without their separation.'

In very many churches this separation is more or less observed among the poor; indeed it is always found that they sort themselves more according to the divisions of their natural

Digitized by Google

estate in life, than by families. Old men are generally seen together, and old women the same, while young men invariably and properly herd with each other and come to church in company. Of young and middle-aged women the same may be always observed as their natural habit. In churches where no rule is kept as to north or south, we find particular pews, or benches, or the different sides of the same gallery, appropriated by long custom to the particular conditions of this transitory life. What is so awkward as to see a young man or young woman, isolated from his or her companions, and surrounded by those of another sex? A rustic youth feels this awkwardness so acutely that in self-defence his only resource is a certain stupid giggling behaviour, which is not desirable in itself or conducive to future good manners. The case of S. Barnabas is well known; as far as our observation goes, the congregations fall naturally into the arrangement, though, from the circumstances of the church, they are composed of that class which is said to have the strongest objection to it. How far S. Barnabas is as yet an example of a parochial church, is not for us to consider, nor in these days is it the fault of the clergy, if church congregations are not strictly parochial. Certain it is, that the division of the sexes is most advantageous, constituted as that congregation is, and that it adds much to the solemnity and to the sense of awe-inspiring exclusion from the world, which ought to be associated with consecrated places. All churches also must be liable to the intrusion of unpleasant people, and open seats of course, to some extent, more so than others; and this being the case, it will undoubtedly remove one great source of uneasiness on this score, if the sexes are necessarily divided. Even thieves go into churches to carry out their avocation, and it is better that this species of humanity, who are of the male gender, should at any rate be kept from annoying Christian ladies in the hours of prayer, as also may be said *vice versâ*.

The church of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, is another example of this division. It was remarkable how quickly the whole congregation fell into the arrangement, the only exception, it is said, on the first Sunday, being a newly married clergyman and his bride, who manifested some unwillingness to part company. Under such interesting circumstances the relaxation for one year from ordinary duties, allowed in the Mosaic law, might be granted if demanded, after which time the question might right itself. On the second Sunday we attended ourselves in our capacity of a Remembrancer, and are able to record the most entire and willing assent of a large congregation to this separation. It was obvious that men squeezed together on one side and women on the other, so as to

Digitized by Google

economize room for more than would have been convenient in a promiscuous amalgamation of bonnets and hats. Very few hints were needed from the vergers. One man, evidently of a retiring and bashful habit of mind, from sheer want of observation, sat upon the edge of a silk dress; the smallest touch, however, of the authoritative wand was quite sufficient to awaken him to a full sense of the horrors of his position and the enormity of his offence. This question will be found more and more connected with open seats as they become, which we hope they will do, the habit of the English Church. The poor adopt it already by very instinct, or from tradition, and it would be a graceful uniformity on the part of others to concede to what is plainly a natural and convenient principle as a general rule. But we shall recur to this again in our general summary as it were of the evidence collected, and meanwhile content ourselves with a conciliatory suggestion for which we have endeavoured to obtain some examples, though without much success. The body of the church might be used according to the free and open system, including the division of the sexes, while the aisles were reserved for those who preferred a more exact appropriation, without any separation of members of a family. We should certainly prefer seeing all after one model, but there would be a kind of balance of advantages in allowing a peculiar and exclusive privilege only in the side aisles, while the unprivileged, who comply with the natural and established rules of the church, occupy the main central part of the building. There is a dignity about the body of the church which would ever prevent its being an *inferior place;* and whatever system was adopted in it would be the rule, and anything else the exception, on the very same principle that at present open benches are often an ignominious exception to the pews in the body of the church. We know of one church where this plan is adopted with good effect. It is not, however, our place specially to advocate it, for we only suggest it as a less evil, and as carrying a less flagrant show of injustice, than appropriating every privilege to the rich, and leaving every fair and open principle to be the despised portion of the poor.

We will now consider open seats as tending to wear away the notion of property in a church. That this is an evil no one can doubt, except those persons who maintain the reverse for their own personal interests. It is obvious that private property in a church is spoliation from the public rights of churchmen. If such claims could be legally substantiated, all that the Church would be able to say would amount to this, 'I imagined this 'building mine, but I find it is not, so I must get a building 'elsewhere.' The Church must have buildings of her own; she

Digitized by Google

cannot perform her offices in other people's property, for then the owners will necessarily have a veto, as it were, on her offices being performed as she wishes. This notion of property is really at the bottom of many objections to the revival of the Church's ritual. The clergyman is only considered to be on sufferance, as an officer appointed to do certain duties in a building that belongs to the shareholders, and therefore, as they suppose, to the Crown, as protector of their rights. It is not for us to dispute legal claims, but it is well that we should be alive to the consequence of them when established. Church property, with such incumbrances on it, is simply lost. If a man has a right to a great pew, why, let him have it, and the Church must get on as she can without it. The bishop, whoever he was, that gave him a faculty, was betraying a public trust in thus alienating the Church's property to private purposes; but if that does in law stand good, the Church must be in the position of one who has received a gift, but who has had it taken away. There are many degrees of spoliation, not only in extent, but in kind; the necessity of extreme measures depends on how far it has gone. In some churches there are one or two pews thus taken from the public, and where from time immemorial the squire of the parish, who is presumed to represent the founder and patron of the church, has thus reserved a portion of the gift originally made, for his own exclusive use, it is not reasonable to say much; there is no fair grievance on the part of the public, and the kind of use made of that pew is a matter concerned with his own religious feeling rather than a subject of legal objection. If he chooses to lock it up, curtain it round, put tables and stoves in it, we can hardly say more than that we do not approve of his religious feeling; provided, of course, that the pew thus used is not in a position to spoil other parts of the church, or be a scandal to the devotional character of the building. It can never be presumed that the founder of a church handed down this right, or any other equally inconsistent with the character of a church, and offered his gift thus spoiled of its value. The Church, moreover, has never accepted such gifts.

The real grievance, however, is where a gradual appropriation has been allowed, either by faculty or prescription on the part of those who represent no original claim at all, but who simply have acted on the general idea that the church belongs to the parish, and therefore may be apportioned to its inhabitants according to their wealth, in the same way that a common is enclosed and divided among the landowners of the parish, reserving only some small portion to represent the rights of the poor. This of itself may often render a church useless from the extent

Digitized by Google

of ground thus appropriated, even if the further evil is spared of those pews being made absolutely private property for purposes of rent and traffic. In some places these evils have grown up to such an extent that the church is no longer a place to which the clergyman can invite his parishioners. He is rather the private chaplain to certain pew-owners. A few years ago there was great danger of the Church being altogether swamped in her public character by these claims, and consequent exclusion of all but a few privileged persons; now, however, things are much improving, and precedents in a legal sense of the word are now going against this spoliation rather than for it, which is a hopeful sign for the future. Carried to a certain extent, it is obvious that the clergy must be driven to perform their offices elsewhere. Those offices are surely of primary importance to the place in which they are to be performed, and therefore if the accustomed place is taken from them, as regards the poor they must seek for another place, and in a parish in Gloucestershire, a new church has actually been built near the old one, because the old one, though amply large enough, has no room for the poor.

We suggested this advantage of open seats to our correspondents, as tending to wear away notions of property in a church, and so self-evident did it appear to all, that few remarks were added to a strong affirmative.

In one case, a clergyman speaking of his own church, which is a town parish church, lately restored, says :—

'This will be undoubtedly the case. The whole of the sittings have been redistributed under a commission, and the churchwardens have been strictly enjoined by the Chancellor, whenever a change takes place in the occupation of a house, to let the seat attach to the *persons* still, if they continue in the parish, and under no circumstances to allow the *same seat* to be occupied by the new occupants of the house in question; in order that the idea of church sittings being attached to a dwelling-house may be destroyed.'

In this case, the question of property is not left solely to the openness of the pews, for the appropriation implied by these remarks must need a further remedy, beyond the absence of doors; but still we find that the openness of church sittings and precautions against personal rights go together. The remarks of our lay correspondent, however, are so much to the point on this subject, that we shall continue it in his words :—

'I imagine that the best practical proof of this proposition (that open seats tend to wear away the notion of property in a church) will be found in the almost universal opposition made to the introduction of open seats on the ground, that thereby persons would lose "their pews." I have found it the most common line of objection, more than even the cry of "Popery," and even where this latter has been made use of, it seems to have been principally to serve as a more decent cloak for the other an

Digitized by Google

more real objection. And it is natural that they should cling to their pews, if there be many places in which, as at Chertsey, in Surrey, the possession of a pew entitles to a vote for the county. This instinctive feeling in the minds of men that open seats will tend to wear away the notion of property in a church, leads to the most determined opposition, which is often too successful, at least for a time. At Kidderminster, proposals were made some years ago to remove all the pews, and Lord Ward agreed to bear all the expense of it, if the people would consent; but the mayor and some of the middle classes refused to give up their pews, on the simple ground that they *were their pews*, and that they could not be turned out. The mayor said, that "if they wanted to build a poor man's church, he would subscribe to it, but that he would not give up his pew, even if he stood alone in it." Others said the same. One of the churchwardens, at a time considerably subsequent to this, endeavoured to seize on a pew by inserting a false floor raised some inches above the old one, placing a lock on the door and marshalling his family in on Sundays; doubtless intending to raise a permanent barrier against the further introduction of open seats in that part of the church: as he had done it on his own private authority, and was a very factious man, the other churchwarden dealt summarily with him, and ordered the lock and false floor to be removed in the course of the week. The existence of locks on the doors of pews, and tables, soft cushions, fireplaces, &c. inside, are so many standing witnesses to the fact that high pews tend naturally to foster the notion of property in a church, and therefore, as a necessary consequence, that open seats, in which none of these things can find place, must tend to wear away such a notion. In common with every one else, I know too many such cases. There is more than one locked pew in —— Church, one of which has been kept practically empty, for a display of political enmity against a gentleman who wished for it. In Walton Church, (Surrey,) there is a pew, jealously guarded, not merely by a lock and bolts, but furnished with iron spikes all round the top. Some few years ago, two ladies went into a church at Brighton, and at the request of the "pew opener" were ungraciously admitted into a very large pew, occupied by one lady: when the sermon was over, she came up to them, and displaying a large key, asked "whether they wished to stay for the sacrament, as she always locked up her pew." Of course the intruders retired, and the lady made her property secure. There can be little doubt that she would have considered a proposal to introduce open seats as a great violation of her rights. At Cobham, in Surrey, several persons, not content with building themselves private galleries in the church, appropriated each one of the windows, turning the centre light into a glass door to give admittance to the gallery, and building a staircase from the outside up to it. At Shepperton, (Middlesex,) under the old system, a single lady had possession of the chief pew in the church, which she inhabited alone. A gentleman fancying that he had a right to the same pew, the following scene was transacted every Sunday. The lady hurried very early into church and locked herself into her pew; in process of time the gentleman came, and placing a form outside the pew, scrambled over the side and thus triumphantly asserted his rights. About the same time all the pew-holders put locks upon the doors of their pews, whereat the poor complained bitterly that they were being locked out of the church. In more than one place I have seen some portion of the rood screen allowed to escape the general ruin, on purpose to barricade or dignify the family pew of the squire. The notions of private property in a church, of which all these things are at once the manifestations and the nourishment, must be seriously weakened, and in time very probably quite rooted out, by the introduction of uniform open seats throughout the church, more particularly if they were not fastened into their places. The idea of personal property, the only tenure

Digitized by Google

whereof was a moveable oak seat, or part of one, would soon become vague and undefined. There appears to be no need to multiply instances of an evil which must be familiar to every one, nor would it be easy perhaps to select any instance so outrageous as to be incapable of parallels in many other places.'

The general state of the law with regard to pews, with its indefinite claims and perplexing precedents, is a great hindrance in many places to church restoration. It requires great courage to face the kind of opposition which some are enabled to make, who are determined on preserving their so-called property. We have but to refer our readers to Mr. Oliphant's 'Law of Pews' to convince them of the difficulty of saying absolutely what you have a right to do and what you have not. It is no wonder that unlettered or even lettered churchwardens succumb entirely to an asserted right, or let the whole question settle itself without any interference whatever. Yet such a course on the part of the authorities of the Church perpetuates and strengthens the evil each generation. If allowed to go on unheeded, the Church would find at some future time her places of worship openly claimed as private property; the law giving its sanction without any apparent spoliation, but simply on the ground of simplifying what is, obviously and to all practical purposes, private property, and clearing individuals of obsolete and troublesome claims on it. The law alters with habit and actual practice, and, if precedents of what may be esteemed the general custom for a certain length of time can be brought forward in evidence, the judges will not decide against it. This principle was apparent, in matters of doctrine and Church discipline, as recently tried in the Hampden and Gorham cases; and in Church property, we may be sure that all theories of openness and freedom would share the same fate, when brought in legal opposition to the overwhelming force of a whole nation's acknowledged practice. Luckily, however, the question has not come to this pass yet, and the reaction already existing, as a fact, must operate very powerfully on all legal decisions. It is, moreover, an invidious thing in the present state of feeling to assert any claims of a very selfish character against the interests of a parish. If circumstances, however, connected with the first suggestion of restoring a church, give any excuse to take the ground of mere resistance against a supposed neglect of personal respect, there are plenty still who will be very troublesome opponents. Such excuses will be assumed often without just cause; but as a matter of prudence, it is well carefully to avoid any use of irritating arguments, or any legal defiance, lest public opinion should support an opponent under such circumstances, when it would not, if he were clearly seen to be acting a mere selfish part.

Digitized by Google

Any appeal to law is to be deprecated at present. It may be necessary sometimes, but experience shows that very much may be done in a quiet way, and especially by a diligent exercise of their proper offices by the authorities of the Church. The question now seems to be in that state, when an adverse decision, resulting from some peculiar circumstances of the case, might be a general discouragement, not at all to be counterbalanced by the chance of a favourable judgment, because time itself is now working the very ground on which future law will be established. It is more wise to keep hold of the popular arguments, than to face the danger of encountering notions of property, which may, perchance, be difficult to destroy, even in law, however unjust they may be. Let, however, cases of assumed right, by faculty or otherwise, be clearly understood and singled out in any attempted restoration; let not a difficult case of such claim protect a whole row of pews by an indefinite supposition that all may be alike. The following letter, extracted from the Ecclesiastical Gazette, we commend as having this in view:—

'*Nottinghamshire.—East Retford.—Selling and letting of Pews.*—Archdeacon Wilkins has addressed the following letter to the churchwardens of East Retford:—"I am informed that it has become a practice with some of those claiming a right over certain pews in our parish church to sell or let them to various persons at an annual rent,—a practice perfectly illegal, and which, if permitted to continue, would operate injuriously against the common rights and privileges of the parishioners at large, and to the prejudice of the Church itself. I request you, therefore, to transmit to me the names and addresses of such persons, that I may cite them to show their faculties, or to prove their prescriptive rights to any such pews as are appurtenant to those houses, or as are described in the faculties, that I may limit the appropriation of them to the occupiers of these houses, and to none other, and that the illegal sale and barter in all such may be arrested. I have further to request that where no such faculties or legal prescriptive titles are forthcoming, you, with the advice of the minister, may place the parishioners forming the congregation in the manner and order prescribed by the regulations and laws of the Church." '

If archdeacons generally were thus to incite churchwardens to examine into cases of claim, and present them to a superior authority, how many shadowy ideas of possession, which are growing into more fixed tenures by length of time, would at once disappear. The multitude, by this means, will be transferred into advocates of a free system, inasmuch as finding their own claims entirely unsupported, they will be jealous of some one or two pews still remaining; and this feeling of jealousy is a powerful instrument in eradicating, by very shame, those few claims which are legally privileged. We know an instance of an obdurate gentleman, who required, when a church was rebuilt, that in the elegant new arrangements he should have

a pew the sides of which were some five or six feet high. As he showed fight in his claims, and was the only troublesome case, his request was conceded; not, however, by disfiguring the appearance of the church with so elevated an enclosure, but by sinking the floor of that one pew, so as to gain the desired height of sides. The gentleman therefore descends into his pew, and as representing the height of pride and the depth of humility, affords an instance of extremes meeting. No one, however, can doubt that by thus exposing so obstinate a claimant to the ridicule of all around him, the claim will soon be extinct.

With regard to legal rights in a church, there are two points which lead to much misapprehension. The one is where, by an unjust bargaining, the churchwardens in time past have obtained a faculty for repewing the church, and have collected money on the understanding that seats are appropriated, in fact given, for ever at so much a head to subscribers; pews are now claimed in many churches because so much money was given to the repewing. Now the fact of building and repairing a pew is received as evidence in favour of a legal claim, but this only when brought in proof of an old faculty or other right; where the origin of such a practice is manifest, and is seen, moreover, to have been unjust, no claim whatever is established by it: nor is the general faculty of any use to establish all the minor arrangements the churchwardens made with individual subscribers. It was only to enable the churchwardens to make those alterations which they saw convenient, presuming of course that they would be guided by law and justice, and therefore not sanctioning anything which they did that was unjust. Such appropriation, therefore, was only in exercise of the common power of churchwardens to arrange the congregation. It was a private agreement between the churchwardens and subscribers that the former would use their power of appropriation, if the latter gave their money to the church. The faculty had nothing to do with it, and the churchwardens, even if they promised more than a common appropriation, did so without any right. The money paid was in law a voluntary offering to the church, involving no claim whatever; in fact, it is absurd to imagine that the small price of putting a few boards together should establish so great an invasion of public rights; as well might any one carry a house made of cast iron into the middle of Hyde Park, rear it up, and because a gatekeeper, for a small fee, said it was all right, imagine that he had established a claim to the site of his house. In that subscription to the church the only expense considered was the mere seat, but there are many other things in a church which must be taken into account before a legal transfer could be supposed, even if

Digitized by Google

legal at all. In estimating the value of any right, it is necessary to include all privileges connected with it, and if only one trifling part of those privileges has been paid for, the presumption is that the right conferred is equally trifling. For purposes of public worship there is more than a seat required, and more is enjoyed by those who have church pews; there is a roof and a building to protect it, to maintain which church-rates are collected, and in which, therefore, all ratepayers continue to have an interest; consequently, without going into the case of demanding any greater possession of a pew than its use during public worship, it is unreasonable to assume any more authoritative appropriation, simply because a seat has been paid for, under circumstances thoroughly known, than is in the common province of churchwardens to allot.

Another common misapprehension is with regard to galleries; it is supposed that they are under a different law to the rest of a church. The same argument just used will apply as well to the erection of a gallery as to a seat in the body of the church. The building of a gallery is no private work, which does not affect other interests. The same roof covers all, and all rest on the same ground. Moreover, a gallery may injure seats under it, and in an architectural point of view there is a public right to preserve the original church in its correct form. From these considerations it follows, that the same powers which rule the body of the church must set the conditions on which a gallery is built. The cases brought forward by Mr. Oliphant explains this subject satisfactorily. He shows the erection of a gallery to be a parish act, exactly the same as if the ground of the church was enlarged. If private parties are allowed to build a gallery for their own use, they have no other tenure than the ordinary appropriation of churchwardens, unless they have a special faculty similar to one they might have had in the body of the church. There is no faculty of right attached to a gallery, as a gallery. The probable cause of the common mistake on this subject is, that the age of building galleries and that of granting faculties were somewhat identical, and therefore that many galleries have specific faculties, though many others pretend to have them, which have not; for a general faculty to build it means nothing; any private right must be supported by a private faculty to an individual.

Further than this we cannot enter into the distinctive province of legal rights, but must refer to the useful works on the subject at the head of our article. Mr. Fowler's little treatise is so easy of access, so plain and unpretending in its character, yet so comprehensive in its information, that to transcribe its pages

Digitized by Google

into our review would be as unnecessary as to go over the same ground with it, when our readers can so easily obtain the book for themselves. We commend it for the general perusal of churchwardens, and all who take interest in the practical restoration of churches, and for this purpose, recommend a cheaper edition, for half-a-crown is enough to exclude it from many houses where it might do much good, and moreover, the appearance and size of it does not quite justify that sum in this age of cheap literature. Coming, as it does, from a layman and a lawyer, it is calculated to carry more weight with it in many people's minds than what might be set down as the rhapsody of an ecclesiastic.

Another proposition which we suggested to our correspondents was the following:—

'That they promote general reverence of behaviour, and bring out the congregational character of our services.'

To which we have the following answers:—

'All persons must admit the truth of this proposition. Without any request from me, the example of two or three devout persons has had such an effect upon the whole body, that they now naturally stand at the Doxology and other parts of the service, when, in the churches round, the careless and slovenly manner of the last century prevails. Kneelings are provided for all, and the majority use them, in time I hope all will do so. The responses are more attended to, and the whole character of the service, which is choral, is improved. To show the evil of high backed seats, I might mention, that a youth was detected smoking a cigar a short time ago behind the pews in a church in this town. Such a thing could not have occurred in my church. Many in my congregation have been dissenters, and at first were accustomed to put on their hats as soon as they rose to leave the church; this practice they have been shamed out of, and the change I attribute to the low seats in a great measure.'

Another Clergyman writes—

'I have found it so. Outwardly I now call mine (measuring them by the average) a devout congregation. The larger proportion of them kneel, which in the old church not one in ten did. But to procure this desirable end, you must provide hassocks, and see also that the seats are wide enough apart, (ours are three feet two inches,) otherwise you will only get "make-believe" kneeling. The great fault of most of our open seats hitherto has been, that the seat itself, and the space between the rows, have been both too narrow and uncomfortable.'

The above remarks we commend to our readers' special attention. The seats there instanced were the result of no ordinary care and experience, in the pattern selected and the space allowed for them. In one old church, visited for hints in the making of them, it was observed that the seats were slightly hollowed out, the result of which was found so very advantageous in the ease of posture afforded, that it was adopted, and is thought a great improvement.

Digitized by Google

Several return under this head a mere affirmative; and in some cases we have observed, more especially in conversation, a hasty passing over of the question, with the remark, that they are afraid it makes but little difference. In some of these cases, however, we suspect that the duty of outward reverence does not come very prominently forward in the teaching of the Clergy attached to the church. Open seats promote reverence where a good example is set, because they increase the force of example generally; but they are quite capable even of a contrary effect where the example of others is bad, or no great point is made of reverence in behaviour. All we expect of the Church system is, that it shall be a fair machinery for the infusion of proper teaching; we do not require it to have a spontaneous effect, though still we believe, that good behaviour is so instinctively attached to the religious services of the Church, that publicity in their performance will have great power in teaching it, and compelling it even from unwilling minds.

Another correspondent says—

'People can kneel all in one direction, without interfering with one another, or exciting notice, whence it produces an unity and intensity (as far as the fit use of outward means can assist), in the devotions of the people.'

Under this head we also find another useful suggestion as to the formation of open seats:—

'I think one point not sufficiently considered in the "lowness" of the backs of seats. The back of one seat should form the rail for another when the congregation are kneeling, and the lower the seats are the more readily are people disposed to gather together closely.'

Many of the advantages of open seats do, in reality, depend on their being well made. They may be so uncomfortable that they defeat the benefit they are calculated to produce. The essentials are found, by experience, to be a low wide seat, a low back, slightly inclined backwards, with a small horizontal book-shelf or elbow-rest for the seat behind, and plenty of space to kneel down in. In S. Mary Magdalene's Church there are no hassocks, and good cocoa matting is, to our taste, quite sufficient; for kneeling on the ground we conceive to be a more easy position of the body, one that balances itself better than kneeling on a height. We speak of course of a body in health and strength; infirmity is the exception, and should have its special provisions. The ordinary arrangements ought always to be on the presumption of health and strength. In kneeling on the ground the whole body rests easily on that part of the knee endued by nature with a strong protecting bone, but in kneeling on an elevated hassock, that part of the knee is brought to bear which

Digitized by Google

is peculiarly tender, and therefore it is that people are compelled to sit, while they pretend to kneel. Again, some room is saved in front by kneeling on the ground; for when the knees are elevated, the body, if it has not recourse to the expedient of sitting, has a tendency to lean forward and rest against the desk in front; in short, it cannot remain upright, and must go backwards or forwards, whereas, in kneeling on the ground nothing more is wanted than the rail or shelf, just spoken of, belonging to the seat in front, perpendicular to the knees. On the supposition, then, of reverential kneeling, the seats must be placed wide apart, in proportion to the height of the hassocks, in order to produce an easy posture. Where persons find difficulty in the act of going down so low, or rising up, they must provide otherwise, but as regards the ease and capacity of the body to remain in the posture of kneeling for any length of time, we feel assured that the lower the knees are the better.

We conclude this head with the following more extended and interesting communication:—

'This position follows in a great measure as a necessary consequence of the truth of the last. It is morally impossible that those persons, who exalt themselves above their brethren in one manner in the house of God, should evince no signs of the same spirit in other things also. I have frequently noticed that the irreverence of certain members of a congregation is in proportion to the greater magnitude of the pew. In a small district church well known to me, one of the congregation presuming on her importance, or, which is practically much about the same thing, the relative importance of her pew, was accustomed to dictate magisterially what hymns should be sung, and was not slow to express her disapprobation in case of any violation of her will. In another church, very near to the last-mentioned, the Vicar having suppressed the hymn-book altogether, the representative of one of the largest pews in the church was, and is to this day, guilty of the gross and rebellious irreverence of finding any hymn of the same metre as the psalm which is being sung, and singing it out to the same tune, in defiance of the Vicar and to the scandal of many of the congregation. I believe there are other large pews in the same church responsible for a similar irreverence. In ——— church there is in one pew a table, the use of which is in no respect clear, except to enable the occupants, or some of them, to sit at the table instead of kneel on their knees. In the chief pew in the church of S. Ives, Cornwall, I remember two tables, or rather desks, equally useful, except that there the occupiers of the pew would either lounge over them, or *sometimes* kneel round them, so as to look into each other's faces. I remember some years ago, there were two families who sat together in a pew in Christ Church, (Newgate Street,) London, and though they could not dispute about the possession of the pew, they did dispute about the pre-eminence of places in it. So that there was a regular race every Sunday for the top places; and I heard one of the contending parties relate rather an acrimonious dispute, which took place in the church about the priority of seats. At Chertsey, in Surrey, there was something of the same kind, but still worse. Two ladies always quarrelled for the top seat in a pew: one, who lived near the church, kept a look-out for the approach of her rival, and then darted into church and took possession of the top of the pew. One Sunday, the

Digitized by Google

defeated lady, seeing no other help, asked her neighbour to hand her a prayer-book, to reach which she had to get up: in a moment the other one darted into the place thus left vacant, and thought she was safe for that day at least; but the rival lady sat down in her lap, and such an altercation commenced, that the priest came out of the desk, and sharply rebuked them both.

'These scandalous irreverences were all voluntary, but there are many which are scarcely in the choice of those who sit in pews to commit or abstain from. In many pews it is almost impossible to kneel down.

'In Ilfracombe church I could manage it by kneeling along the pew, but if there were many persons in it besides myself, I was obliged, more than once, to give it up altogether. In one or two churches near Dublin, I found the seats so constructed as to render kneeling, except by turning my back on the altar, scarcely practicable. The congregations seemed to acknowledge the difficulty, and either knelt on the seat, leaning over the backs of the pews, or stood upright, or sat still.

'The irreverence of talking or sleeping in church I pass by, because it may be committed under any circumstances, although the high pew system is unquestionably the mother and nurse of this, as of so many other profanations of the house of God. Under shelter of the high walls of a pew, people wax bold to do things, which, were their actions open to the eyes of men, they would not dare to do so. I have sometimes been disturbed throughout a whole service by the conversation of others in the next pew, whom there was no possibility of requesting to behave more reverently, without a process of climbing which would have made the remedy fully as bad as the evil itself.

'Still persons will say, as they have said to myself frequently, when in conversation on such matters, that these evils arise from the state of the heart, not from the size of the pew, or the height of its sides, and that precisely the same things may take place in open seats. Without entering into the question critically, which would probably show the above statement to be, as usual, a compound of truth and error, it will be better and more appropriate to the nature of these remarks, which respect simply my own personal knowledge, testimony, and experience, to say simply, that as a matter of fact I believe that assertion to be a great mistake; if it be meant to imply that where there are open seats these same abuses are *equally* found. In every church that I know, where the seats are open, there is far more reverence (taking it as a whole, and making an average calculation) than in those churches where high pews remain. I was particularly struck with this contrast a very few years ago in Penzance. In the great church, where there were pews, there was a great deal of general irreverence visible throughout the service; while at a new chapel, or district church, S. Paul's, I believe, which I attended the same day, the congregation being all in low seats, (I forget whether all were open, or whether there were some low doors,) I saw more reverence of demeanour over the whole congregation, which was, for the size of the chapel, very large, than it has ordinarily been my privilege to witness. At Littlemore, also, which I attended occasionally during my Oxford life, there was every appearance of great reverence. And as regards the congregational character of our services, I fear this is prized but lightly by those who support pews, because they are "more private" and "quiet" than the open seats. All the paraphernalia of brass rods and red curtains, &c. &c. seem designed especially to exclude the notion of our services being congregational, or of "common prayer" altogether. In several churches which I remember (I may make particular mention of Ilfracombe), if all the congregation knelt down properly, any one might stand at the west end and not see a single person in church, except perhaps in the pews close to him. Some

Digitized by Google

of the pews at the east end of Ilfracombe church are six feet high. As a type of the advantage of open seats in making the services more truly congregational, S. Barnabas may serve instead of a whole string of less perfect examples.

'A high pew carefully fenced off from all communion with even its fellow-pews, and raised sublime above the poor "free seats," is no inapt symbol of a supreme and contemptuous and truly independent private judgment, which, as the advocates thereof love to express it, makes religion a matter wholly and solely between the individual man and his Maker. The communion of saints seems a little out of place in such a creed.'

The last proposition to which we shall here give any methodical order is the following:—

'That their adoption does, as a general rule, promote the cause of the Church among the poor, by giving them certain positive advantages, both of comfort and situation, and also by setting before them the equality of Christian worship.'

In reply to this we read from one quarter:—

'My people are mostly poor, and any distinction in the seats would have had the effect of driving them away. Numbers attend our daily service in consequence of the comfort they enjoy at church.'

Another says:—

'I do believe that the people feel that they have some property in the church, and can worship without respect of persons, as far as the first subordinations of life allow. There is nothing, indeed, more difficult to arrange than an adjustment of pews. At Yarmouth it caused great discontent in one or two parties; but as these rights manifestly were at variance with the general benefit, they have been lost in the feeling of the rest. Nor do I believe that even they would now advocate a return to the old system. It is one great means to *popularize* the Church as an institution to meet the spirit of the times, and resist the outward pressure, for the old state of things was adapted to quite a different view of both spiritual and political relations and intelligence.'

Again:—

'There can be no doubt, as open seats become more general, and the theory of congregational worship is better understood, that the prejudices of a past generation will wear out, and our posterity will wonder what the religion of their forefathers could have been, when wealthy people boxed themselves up in huge square tall pews, half as big again as their necessities required, and left the poor, the aged, and the infirm to sit in such out of the way corners as they might chance to find.'

The relations between rich and poor vary much in town and country. The same persons, who fall into the most exclusive notions when in London, almost from the necessity of the case, feel very different when surrounded by their own labourers and dependents in the country. Let, however, the true spiritual position of the poor be fostered where it may. There is no occasion for country places to labour under difficulties, so strongly felt in London, but which may be more easily overcome on their own parts. The *general* tendency of open seats towards

Digitized by Google

this wholesome equality is borne witness to by the experience of our *tourist*:—

'As far as my experience carries me, I can give unqualified testimony to the proposition. In many places,—Kidderminster, Chippenham, may stand as instances,—I have met with proofs of this. At Kidderminster, when the church was opened first after the alterations, very few poor comparatively were present; the reason which they gave, to those who inquired the reason, was commonly, that they supposed that that was only meant for the gentry and not for them: they thought they would not be admitted at the reopening. However they very soon learnt that the beautiful church was for them as much as for others, and, for a considerable time, it was filled to overflowing. The daily service, I should say, has been far more numerously attended than before, and I know that many of the poor take more delight in the Church and her services. Of course, in a place like Kidderminster, the stronghold of all separation since the days of Baxter, this effect can only be very partial; but still I am persuaded that such has been the result, and I think I may say that the open seats have very much conduced to it. In many places I have heard the poor lament over the pews, as practically excluding them from the church, and they, like the Mayor of Kidderminster, began to think that a poor man's church must be a different kind of thing altogether; and I agree with them, the churches must in this particular be changed, if we are to lay any very firm hold on the affections of the poor. What a poor man would think of a church, where the altar was thrust westwards to make room for a great pew behind, I do not know! certainly he would not suppose it was done for his use or spiritual advantage. This was done in a church in Worcestershire. I have seen the pew, but have some impression that it has been removed, though I am by no means certain. In the following churches, also, I know that pews have been exchanged for open seats with the happiest results:—S. Martin's, Salisbury; Coombe Bassett and Woodford, both near Salisbury. The congregations, in all these cases, have increased exceedingly since the alteration, and that not from the poorer classes only, but from all. In one case I am informed that the congregation has nearly doubled.'

The advantages of the poor are much brought in contact with the prejudices of the rich, in all proposals of making church seats free and open. Therefore, as a corollary to the last proposition, we endeavoured to elicit any remarks our correspondents were enabled to make on the chance of those hostile prejudices wearing away. In reply to this, our above-quoted most able and valuable helpmate in our present article gives his experience as follows:—

'That the prejudices of the middle classes may be overcome to these arrangements, may be inferred from the fact of the existence of these arrangements in many places where they were not some time ago; for I fear there are not many cases in which the alterations were made without opposition. In Shepperton there was a furious opposition, which was not overcome till long after the alterations had actually been made, a vote in vestry deciding in favour of it in the teeth of the adverse faction. By degrees, however, it wore away, and I should think that all parties now are perfectly reconciled to it. At Kidderminster, patience, and reasoning, and preaching, have at last been successful; and by this time I hope there are no pews left, either in the body of the church or in the aisles. The galleries and their pews are

Digitized by Google

at present, I fear, beyond reach, and they are the worst abuses of all. Even the mayor, who was so obstinate when the same thing was proposed before, and whom I heard declaiming in the streets, the next Sunday, against "all Roman doings," has signified his consent, perhaps not persuaded, but for some reason rendered malleable. At Ilfracombe, the Vicar told me that he did not expect any serious opposition to the proposal, which he will make as soon as the money can be raised, and spared from the building of a new church which is in progress. At Trowbridge it has been done, and gives, I believe, gratification to all. At ——, if we had the money, I have great hopes that we might succeed in weaning the people over, except perhaps in one or two instances, where it seems to be a point of honour to hold by the pews, equally with other things that hinder the restoration of the church. But even these cases, which appear so stubborn, may, by little and little, be sometimes brought over. I know one or two instances of persons holding out alone for a long time, hoping to hinder thereby the whole work; and, at last, when it has been done without them, coming and begging that their pew might be removed also. At Chippenham the prejudices have been successfully surmounted, except in the case of one lady, who still holds "her own;" and a kind of compromise seems to have been effected with the mayor and corporation, who have now seats made like the rest, only with doors, and rather higher, so as to be easily distinguishable from the surrounding crowd; but yet are far, very far better than the old-fashioned "corporation pews."'

We shall now bring the general collection of testimony in favour of the open-pew system, with which we have been kindly furnished, to a close, by giving one letter entire, as its general character would have been lost if dissolved into parts:—

'I feel that both my parish and myself are of too rustic a character to furnish any satisfactory answers to methodical inquiries like yours. We are not in circumstances to say anything at all to most of them. Meanwhile this is the sort of result we have found among ourselves. The people are vastly pleased to have the Squire and the ladies mixed up, for their prayers and instructions, among themselves, and have a very comfortable feeling that, so far, we are all right, and that what Scripture says, and what we do, agree very well together. Then, it is evident that they leave off ugly habits of their own, and adopt very seemly ones, from those whose reverent behaviour at church is a part of their good breeding, taking the course of devotion. Thus, almost all learn to do as they should; and any offence is seen by all, and is a nuisance to all. All know, too, that it cannot be hid, whether they are at church or not; the Parson sees all without staring, and is heard of all without screaming. There are, indeed, drawbacks, real or pretended. Thus the farmer who will take two goblets of ale at his good Sunday dinner, when one would have been enough, goes fast asleep still, and snores, and lays it upon the fatigue given to his stout back by being kept bolt upright, with nothing to rest his shoulders or his head; but his wakeful labourer, in the next bench after him, sets the matter right, and shows how the world goes in the church as well as out of it. There will also arise disputes about places, from time to time; but they are much more easily settled and traced straight home to ill tempers, and not to real inconveniences. And certainly the whole character of the congregation, and so of the parish generally, has vastly improved under the open-seat system, and I am commonly asked whether the people were always as attentive and well-behaved as they are now. I have nothing more to add, &c.'

Digitized by Google

Two other letters also, which we are unwilling to exclude, have arrived too late to be placed under the several heads we have been considering; we therefore leave them to be arranged, in a restrospective manner, by our readers.

The first is from a country Clergyman of most varied acquaintance with the ecclesiastical arrangements in all countries and ages.

'A new parochial district was formed in Yorkshire, and the church consecrated fourteen months ago. The seats are all open, and all are unappropriated except about six pews; and, except in these pews, the sexes are divided. The clergyman finds this arrangement work extremely well; it admits of the church being used with ease and success by the whole of the parishioners. On all Sacrament days, the morning service is divided, with entire acquiescence on the part of the congregation, and services are multiplied without any difficulty.

'My own opinion is entirely favourable to open and unappropriated seats, and the division of the sexes. At the consecration of a church in a large town some few years ago, I met a numerous body of clergy at an Inn, and took the opportunity to ask if any of them had divided the sexes in their churches. Three of the clergy replied that they had done so; and they said it worked so extremely well, that if the clergy in general would only try the same plan, they would all like it.'

The opportunities of our other correspondent are stated by himself:—

'1. In my last parish, in Kent, I had a favourable opportunity of observing the results of the open-seat system in a chapel of ease which was built in a distant hamlet, and where unquestionably it worked very beneficially. I will, therefore notice, seriatim, your questions so far as I can in any way assist you. Some of the open seats were appropriated to the principal farmers in the most eligible parts of the chapel; but, although appropriated, were never, or scarcely ever, empty. For in the absence of the parties to whom they were appropriated, they were occupied by others; or, when the chapel was very full, the room not occupied by members of the particular families, was filled by those who required accommodation. I cannot say that I found the congregation assembled in the best parts of the chapel, when room was not an object, for even in the unappropriated parts regularity of attendance seemed to secure one and the same seat or seats to the same parties; and I have frequently noticed that, when such parties have not been early at church, the seats have for a time been left unoccupied, presuming on the certainty of attendance. Undoubtedly there was less waste of room than in the pew system; for when the *vacant* seat was needed, it was claimed even in the appropriated parts, and there appeared to be a greater desire to accommodate those in want of accommodation, than I have noticed in the old *doored*-pew system.

'2. Of this (viz. that open seats do not cause disorder, &c.) I think there can be no doubt. So far from observing any disturbance or confusion, I have frequently noticed (after the commencement of Divine Service) the parties, to whom seats were appropriated, taking their places in other parts of the chapel, because their own seats had been previously filled; and this without any question or difficulty.

'3. About this, (the division of the sexes,) I am not so sure. Women are more captious than men on their *rights* in church. And throughout my

Digitized by Google

experience I have had more questions raised between women, as to their particular places, than I have ever had with men.

'4. I think it will be generally found that where there is a division of sexes, the aisles must be the unappropriated, and the whole or a part of the nave, (as the case may be,) the appropriated division of the building. The church at Great Tew, however, in Oxfordshire, is an illustration of the contrary, where, in a church of nave and aisles, the whole large area of the nave is for the poor, and the aisles for the farmers; the free sittings being much more filled than the others.

'5. There can be no doubt that they promote general reverence of behaviour; for being low as well as open, the occupants are so completely under eye, that none of those irregularities of behaviour, or want of reverence, which frequently take place within the enclosure of a pew, can occur. Shame, if no better feeling, prevents persons from attracting attention by singularity of conduct or gesture.

'6. I certainly remarked, as one of the results of the open-seat system, that there was a greater willingness to attend on the part of the poor; that no excuses were ever made on account of the position to which they were banished, and the only annoyance expressed was when residents in another part of the parish made a practice of coming to "our" chapel, as they called it, and occupied the room and accommodation which they felt had been erected for their use and benefit.

'7. Inasmuch as the poor especially take a greater interest in the open seats, I have no doubt that they would lead to the more frequent opening of churches for public, if not for private use. When first I went to ——, Christmas Day and Good Friday had never been observed in the district in which the chapel of ease was built; but within three years after its erection, the observance of those days was strict, and the attendance at public worship large.

'8. When once accustomed to open seats, I do not think that any class desires to return to the old pews. The greatest difficulty is to reconcile the middle classes to a change, which, in their estimation, deprives them of distinction and dignity; but when they see their superiors occupying open seats in no respect distinguished from the poorest, they soon become satisfied.

'I do not think I can have thrown any light upon your questions, so as to help you in any respect; but I will not withhold the result of my experience, such as it is, especially as it extends over a period of eight or ten years' observation.'

There is one large branch of the subject of pews, which requires a distinct notice, apart from any remarks that have yet been dwelt on: we mean the question of pew rents in district churches. The original theory of openness and freedom, which, more or less, is still legally attached to old parish churches, had been so far forgotten in practice, as a necessary element of Christian worship, that when, in later times, the need of fresh churches was forced upon the public, the system of pew rents was resorted to as the foundation and support of Church extension. Parliament issued Church Building Acts, authorizing and regulating the system, bargaining only for a small share of the church to be free, for the use of the poor, and not making any conditions as to the position of those seats. In London and other populous

Digitized by Google

districts, the great church-going population of the middle classes are now habituated to this system, for their religion has long depended on it; the peculiar privilege of a parish church being confined to a very few in such parishes, for instance, as S. Pancras, or Birmingham. The whole state of things, in a social aspect, is, moreover, so very different in these situations to what it is in moderate sized or country parishes, that there is a peculiar difficulty in urging the *equality* argument against such purchasing of religious privileges. For quiet and respectable people, who love repose on the Sunday, who pay their way in other things and are willing to do so in religion, without any notion, either in themselves or others, of munificent offerings to the Church, there is a great charm in taking a seat in the neighbouring church, to which they may go or not as the humour takes them, but in which they are undisturbed when they do go. The idea of neighbourhood, which gives reality to the congregational feeling of a small parish,—where all know each other in their respective positions either of master, labourer, buyer, seller,—is extinct where nobody knows who lives next door; and spiritual equality with the greengrocer is neither sought for, nor is much considered among the various items of social economy. The advocacy of open churches will, therefore, require a greater amount of unsupported faith in London than in the country. Nor are the difficulties likely to decrease; on the contrary, if things go on as we should desire, they will much increase, as the lower classes are brought into the question by a greater wish to go to church. It is but reasonable that we should consider the different relations which subsist between the rich and the poor under these different circumstances of locality. In the country, your poor neighbours are men who work in your fields, whose cottages you visit, whose wives you talk to and help in their troubles, and whose children go to your school, and who themselves greet you on meeting, in recognition of your office or station,—whether that be lay or cleric. A country parish is a family, the members of which are really known to each other, or between whom there is really felt to be a bond of union, either in the working of the Church, or even in the periodical gathering together of the main body of masters in a parish meeting, in order to regulate all parochial matters of general interest. There is a chance also here of the very worst of your neighbours leaving the place, because their habits find no encouragement or field for their exercise. In such a place, there is a sensation of the various classes of society being within the scope of individual sympathy, and therefore it is a manageable thing to impress on well-disposed people the benefit of all this parochial family worshipping God on an equal footing

Digitized by Google

within those walls consecrated to religion. Contrast this with London. Your neighbours there are connected by no sort of social tie with yourself, a large class of them are perfectly inaccessible, and do not want any connexion with you, except in the way of trade or employment. The few children, in proportion to the parish, whom you may know in the school, are isolated children, affording but a slender link between the clerical or lay visitor of the school, and the parents; while the lanes and alleys are inhabited not exclusively by that class of poor, over whom the necessary habits of industry are some check, but perhaps by those who are the very refuse of the whole country, who live as ministering spirits to the vices and luxury of others, and who taint the whole neighbourhood and the whole condition of poverty with a ban of exclusion from all intercourse with their respectable rich neighbours.

Under the sanction, then, of Acts of Parliament regulating the affairs of 'the Established Church,' it is no wonder that the church going population of London are altogether associated with pew rents. The practical desertion of the poor from church was not their fault, they may say; all they wish is that they may go to church quietly. Satisfying any scruples about the theoretical poor, who ought to be in the house of God, by looking at the word 'free' in some corners near the door as they enter, they shrug their shoulders, (or, if ladies, wave their dresses,) walk up in stately independence to their pew, and after well securing the latch of the door and repeating a short litany to the name of their hatter, are prepared to 'hear divine service,' with the honest consciousness that they have paid beforehand for the privilege, and that the balance of account is always in their own favour. Such is the way of the London world, though, of course, with exceptions; and for this system were the greater number of churches expressly built. The Clergy depend on pew-rents, and therefore *ex officio* are their advocates, or are perhaps helpless parties in what they do not like, but are obliged to endure. Now this would be all very well, if the church thus built only professed to be the private chapel of certain individuals who club together, and, like Micah, hire a Levite of the Establishment to be their priest, with the ephod, teraphim, and graven image of pulpit hangings, altar cushions, and all the paraphernalia of a *neat* church, and who give him victuals in the shape of an occasional invitation to dinner, and a suit of apparel, represented by a black gown from the ladies, in testimony of their esteem, and also ten shekels of silver in the form of pew rent. In this case we might excuse one church, thinking that another would supply the obvious deficiency in accommodating the poor. But the case is quite different when

Digitized by Google

these churches are meant to have, and in a sense have, a parochial territorial charge, and represent the mother Church, in all its advantages, to those within certain limits. Now in the present state of feeling which a London Clergyman finds among the poor of a parish, has he any hope of drawing them to such a church, when all the force of habit is against going at all? does he not feel it an unreal invitation, because he cannot ask them on such terms as he feels that the services of his church ought to receive them? It was surely in the first instance a rash departure from the ancient system of our Church—that by which the land was spread over with noble buildings and ample endowments—to allow the miserable substitute of pew rents to be the means on which to extend our Church to an increased population; and experience now shows, that however it may have benefited one class, yet that the poor are not included in such a system, as they were in the more ecclesiastical type; in fact, that such a church is not in any practical sense a territorial centre of the Church Catholic for the district allotted to it, in the manner which a country parish is clearly seen to be. The very principle of uniformity should have prompted the building of new churches under the same principle as the old, especially when this country owes so much to her parochial system; but experience now most amply proves, that our forefathers were wiser than this generation in such things, or, which is more to the point, were more liberal; for Providence ordains that the Church's best system shall not be one which cost her members nothing: she flourishes best on the practice of her highest virtues, on chivalrous self-denial and bountiful munificence.

The evil of pew rents is not, however, confined to the class who are altogether excluded by them; there are many whose notions of religious service altogether are much injured by the trickery and underhand work resulting from the whole system, especially among those who are ashamed of going to *free seats*, and are unwilling or unable to pay rent. On this point we have received the following communication:—

'In the new churches, not endowed, the question of open seats cannot be severed from the question of pew rents. It is to be remembered that in London there is a large class who are not poor (*i. e.* recipients of alms) who yet cannot pay pew rents, and to drive whom into benches distinguished as "free," is to drive them from church; while, if the contribution to the maintenance of the church were voluntary, by a weekly or monthly collection, they would contribute more in proportion to their means than those do who now rent pews. Pew renting is a matter of business, and is treated as such. It is thought a proper economy to consider how few seats need be rented. In a family of four or five, it is thought sufficient to take two or three seats, as one will most probably be absent from church, and there is a certainty of some other vacant place in the same or a near pew, "and so we can manage." Others, yet more economical, rent no seats,

Digitized by Google

but by a liberal gratuity to the attendants, secure the seats of absentees. These things are done by people, who, if appealed to to maintain divine service, would treat the matter in a different spirit. Others, ashamed to occupy seats for which rents are asked which they cannot pay, wander from church to church, making a rule to themselves not to be at one church above once in a month, or two or three times successively. Great laxness naturally follows, or some cheap seat at a dissenting chapel attracts them. I cannot but think that, as a general rule, as liberal a provision would be made by voluntary offerings as by pew rents; but where the Clergy have not confidence enough to rely on their people in this manner, some proper sum might be fixed upon and raised by subscription through the district, on the personal application of a lay committee. Of course there is a want of independence in the clergyman where the provision is so obtained, but there must be as great a want or greater where it is obtained by pew rents.'

The present system of pew rents, with the exclusive congregations they foster, has a doctrinal evil attending it as well as being a breach of Christian morals, and especially so where the church has a district allotted to it, and thus is entrusted with the territorial charge of all members of the Church resident therein. A church thus built seems to be founded on the business-like theory, that the pew renters are the parish, and that admission to the services of the Church, except under very humiliating circumstances, is in their hands. Now, in an abstract point of view, Christians have a right to meet together and shut the doors against strangers, but this is on the supposition that the excluded persons are heathen. To shut any persons out from the full equality of Christian worship is a kind of excommunication, and is felt to be so. Yet the sacraments and ordinances of the Church are administered to this excluded class; they are in such things esteemed Churchmen; they are baptized, confirmed, married, &c., by the Church, and yet the worship of the Church is not open to them with like freedom that her sacraments are afforded. The result of which must be to make such ordinances degenerate in their minds; for an inner circle is seen to exist, of persons far more privileged than the reception of Church ordinances of itself implies; whereas all practical ideas of excommunication from the body of the church, ought to be connected with the reception or non-reception of those ordinances. To some extent this danger applies to other evils in our Church, but it admits of most clear demonstration with regard to pew rents. It seems altogether unchristian to allow any practical exclusion of those whom the true discipline of the Church admits to be her own children, nay, territorially dependent on that very Church with its Clergy. The discipline of the Church is here sunk in consideration of mammon, and her exclusion is not sacramental, but pecuniary.

But those churches would seem to require special notice

Digitized by Google

where a better system has been tried; where great sacrifices have been made to establish a more ecclesiastical type of Church extension. It is difficult to bring such churches forward in proof of any particular principle which forms part of their system, for many other questions are involved in their general working. S. Barnabas, for instance, S. Andrews, Well Street, or S. Mary Magdalene, are in a peculiar position, and whether right or wrong in what they do, they are obviously not a fair test of all points connected with open seats, though, as to the fact of congregations assembling in them quietly and orderly, they are eminent instances. A *few* churches only can indeed never be proper examples of any general principle in a place like London, and for this reason: they are filled not with a true parochial congregation, but with persons who from preference to the system there carried out, or even from curiosity, go to them, and prevent any quiet working of the Church into its own parishioners. This is not the fault of the Clergy nor of the system; for, suppose the system good, and generally adopted, there would be no motive for individuals to leave their own district, for they would have the same at home. Then, again, the question of open seats is at present involved in so many other points of theology, that with them its merits are only as yet appreciated by that class which takes general interest in Church questions of the day. Among the poor those few churches are not extensively known or distinguished from their general idea of all other churches, because the Church question, as a whole, has not yet interested them; moreover, their previous conceptions of the church as a place for rich people, must necessarily be kept up, against all effort of the Clergy to the contrary, by the numbers of rich people who flock into them and fill them. This is a necessary state of things, and has its uses; but such churches will for some time labour under the difficulty of being models and examples of certain principles, rather than being quietly let alone to work their own way as churches of a territorial division in the Church Catholic. Yet, in spite of this peculiar difficulty in such churches as we have mentioned, no one can have attended them without perceiving a far different character in the congregation to what is seen in a closely pewed metropolitan church. There is a congregational brotherly freedom, which makes a stranger feel at home and at rest. In the case of S. Andrew's, we fear that the necessity of supporting their exquisite choir, has rather kept out the considerations we are now chiefly advocating, and that there have been many concessions towards the pew-renting system; but so it must ever be, for the mind of man is not all-comprehensive; by developing one principle, the mind loses sight of another; or

Digitized by Google

rather, when bent on one object, any difficulties which present themselves assume the aspect of something to be got rid of at any risk; if money is wanted, money must be got. The principle of free and open churches has, in the other cases, however, taken a firm root, which we trust will not be torn up under any trials or temptations. The non-parochial character of such congregations must be regretted, but is no reason for altering the system; the fault lies in other churches not following their example, rather in their not conforming to the too common practice of pew rents, with all their contaminating evils.

The question of pew rents assumed last year a more offensive aspect than ever, because there was danger of its being engrafted into our Church more inextricably than at any previous time. Various schemes for Church extension among the poor have been suggested, but last year, as our readers will probably remember, the plan of very low pew rents in churches, even for sittings that had been guaranteed free for ever, and also the plan of churches specially for the poor, was hit upon, and provisions for the former were very nearly being introduced into the Church Building Amendment Act of the session. Luckily, however, this was warded off, thanks to those Churchmen who are on the alert for such things. We extract a useful letter from the *Guardian*, with its signature attached to it, which was written while this was in discussion:—

'THE CHURCH AND THE POOR.

'*To the Editor of the Guardian.*

'SIR,—I would most earnestly call the attention of every Churchman and friend of the poor to those clauses in what is called "the Church Building *Amendment* Act," now before parliament, and which would impose a rental upon free sittings—upon those seats which were given to the poor for ever, and which are therefore their own.

'The poor, it is said, prefer paying a small sum, in order that they may *ensure* for themselves a sitting.—I deny it. There are amongst churchgoers some persons so very poor, that they cannot spare, from their necessities, any the very smallest sum in addition to their present outgoings; the education of their children, or their continuance in a clothing club, is often prevented by the onus of a weekly penny.

'The evils of the pew system have been again and again exposed. Pews have, in many cases, cast out the poor from our churches, and have thereby caused ignorance and schism; they induce irreverence—they lead to hatred and uncharitableness amongst neighbours.

'It may be told that a revival of *pews* is not contemplated by this bill. But what will be the result? A bench will be appropriated for an annual payment to a family—not necessarily to a poor family; what will then follow to make it exclusive? a door—perhaps, a lock to the door—the front and back raised for *privacy?* Have we not here a legitimate pew? The last words uttered by the late Bishop Stanley in my hearing were these: "If I live six years, I do not believe there will be a pew in my diocese." How little did he contemplate that, three years only after he spoke, a bill

Digitized by Google

would be sanctioned by some of his brethren on the bench, which would tend to undo all that he and others had been zealously striving to accomplish! What a gross breach of faith is this, as regards those munificent persons who have either built, or given money for the erection of churches, on the express condition that they should be altogether free; and thus that Christ's fold should be enlarged by admitting the poor of His flock! These rents may be applied for the benefit of the clergyman himself, or for building him a house; so that the poor will consider themselves robbed by the Church Commissioners for the benefit of their clergyman. Will this insure peace and harmony in a parish, or increase respect for the pastor? And is there no other mode of adding to a clergyman's income? Has not the Church her offertory? In ancient times one-fourth of the offerings was allotted to the clergy. What is still read from the altar? "Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things live of the sacrifice?" "Let him that is taught in the word, minister unto him that teacheth."

'I was never disposed to "stir up strife," and my object in writing this letter is "to prevent the beginning of strife," for such will unquestionably be the fruits of this bill.

'May God grant success to every effort which shall be made to arrest it in its progress!

'I am, Sir, your obedient and faithful Servant,

'*Bath, June* 23, 1851. 'J. H. MARKLAND.'

A private letter, also, to the writer of the above, and with reference to it, has been kindly sent for our perusal, as containing the opinion of a clergyman in a populous neighbourhood, well entitled to respect from the amount of his experience:—

'I was very glad to see, in the *Guardian* of last week but one, a letter from you, calling attention to the act of gross injustice, which, if Churchmen be not vigilant, may be perpetrated by parliament in the matter of free sittings. I quite agree with you, that a *large* majority of the poor would *not* prefer paying even a nominal sum, to receive a sitting which they can call their own. This is the case with some who have been brought up under the pew system, but it is not true of the mass, who are ready to avail themselves of Church privileges as soon as the odious distinction between rich and poor shall be generally obliterated from our churches. The iniquities of the pew system have alienated so many, that time alone will do away with the prejudices which tend to keep some persons from church, even in cases where that horrid system is abolished.'

But, it is often said, there is accommodation for the poor: so many seats are allotted to them. Now there is much absolute deception in the statistics of Church Building Societies. An imposing proportion of free seats is put before the public, but on examination this is found sometimes to include some out-of-the-way corner—under the tower, for instance, fitted up with minute benches for the school children. The law is said to be satisfied by that arrangement, and a grant, accordingly, is obtained, on the supposition of benefiting the poor by giving free seats. We heard, on one occasion, a few facts of this kind brought before a meeting of the Church Building Society, which sadly disturbed that quiet self-satisfied composure with which the Bishop in the chair, the Archdeacon and others on the plat-

Digitized by Google

form, were, according to custom, praising the immense liberality bestowed on the poor. The 'disturbing influence' stated, in an honest and straightforward manner, that the number of seats sounded well, but he feared nobody ever occupied them, which really could hardly be wondered at, considering the sort of accommodation they were. The unfortunate individual who had ventured thus far, began now to perceive the awful mistake he was making by such unpleasant allusions. Dead silence and uncomfortable looks greeted such ill-omened words, till the impression was conveyed to him, that really it was uncourteous to the Bishop to ruffle the tranquillity of his lordship's mind, and that an apology was due for perverting so amicable an assembly, to the discussion of subjects little designed for it.

We have not, as yet, noticed Mr. Stuart's Sermon, the title of which we placed at the head of our article; nor is it necessary that we should repeat what he there says on these pages;—indeed, since our first perusal of it, we have avoided any further reference to it, and for this reason. That Sermon and Appendix, with the noble example of its teaching set by the author himself in the Church of S. Mary Magdalene, are so open to all who take interest in the subject—that is, we should hope, to all Churchmen—that it is most advantageous to our present purpose simply to adduce the author, his words and works, in confirmation of all we have said. We feel that he and ourselves are aiming at one and the same object; and as our wish, at present, is not to commence an interchange of compliments between fellow-labourers, but rather to promote a certain cause, we have desired to take our own line, without any reduplication of his arguments, and in perfect independence of them.

At the commencement of our article, we pictured, as it were, certain primæval ideas of Christian worship, in order that our readers might look at all which followed through a free and natural atmosphere. It remained for us to survey the question in a practical manner, and consider how those essentials which nature and Christian morals require in our religious worship, may best be complied with under existing circumstances. Availing ourselves of the kind help of friendly experience and friendly suggestions, we have accordingly brought forward many facts and general remarks on the whole subject, which now it is becoming that we should sum up by some reflections that may seem to arise from them.

Freedom and openness to baptized members of the Church for her services and offices is an essential of Church arrangements, for otherwise there cannot be proper stress laid on the duty of Christian worship. When a congregation is assembled together, there are many great advantages in producing that

Digitized by Google

sensation in each individual's mind, which makes his service a free and voluntary act, prompted by his belief in certain spiritual benefits to be derived by it, and his desire to obtain them. Each member present should therefore feel, that what is going on is his own, that he is a component part as it were of the transaction; that the Clergy are exercising certain functions for him, and that the building itself is all his, by a common participation in it with others. One part of the church he ought to feel as much his own as another. Objects of interest may be dispersed throughout the church,—painted windows, fine and touching pieces of sculpture, corners suited for retirement, or meditations of a specific character, and other suggestive details, in which the general effect and sublimity of the Church and her services may be more gloriously contemplated. Now, each member of the Church should feel that all these are his in their turn, and that he need not be confined to one or a few of them, but that he may walk about free and open in the courts of the house of his God, and dwell on the beauty of holiness with some foretaste of celestial exemption from the barriers which earth and matter elsewhere place before him. But such considerations as these bring us at once to the general use of a church, for there are many theories on this subject, to some of which our remarks would not be applicable. That theory which places each household in a box, (we know an instance of a little child on returning from church, saying she had been in a box,) and ignores anything but the voice of the reader or preacher, is right so far as it makes the functions of the Clergy the natural focus of the building; but it is wrong in its comprehension of the nature of those functions, for it does not recognise that sacramental union which flows from them, and which makes all who come within their influence members one of another, as well as recipients of instruction from the clerical office for their individual profit; for the true grace of the Church's ministrations makes the whole building a type of a more immediate Divine presence that will be hereafter. The material building of the Church may, by another theory, be raised to be the first consideration, the Clergy being looked upon as ministers in the *Church*, rather than the Church, as but the veil and protection of clerical ministration,—holy because they are holy, consecrated by them. The consecration of churches is no charm apart from other and regular offices of religion: it has become a distinct office, because the general sanctity of all places of Christian worship is so established a rule, that it is represented in an express manner when a new church is built, as if to impart to the new comer the overflowing sanctity of its fellows, to welcome it by anticipation with the fruits of its own future ministrations, in common with

Digitized by Google

those of the whole Church Catholic. The consecration of churches arose from the typical character of Christian worship, producing a true and impressive sentiment of attachment, for that part of the material world, which is honoured with serving to heavenly purposes. The powers of art were resorted to, to carry out this idea, by making the building itself to speak *of* heaven and heavenly thoughts. These considerations were also seen to be in conformity with the whole type of Divine worship recorded in the Old Testament, and therefore the holiness of the place itself is thoroughly engrafted into the Church system. The holiness of Christian offices, by this means, seems to linger in the accustomed place of their performance, and not to be restricted altogether to the actual periods in which they are done. They create an abiding sanctity, a holy atmosphere in the building.

Taking therefore, what seems to us, the true view of Christian worship; that the clerical functions are the central objects of attraction, while the holiness of the building is most true and profitable, but arises out of the former, and is therefore secondary; holding these two considerations together for mutual explanation, we shall arrive at a clear insight into the proper arrangement of a church, which may best carry out the object for which it was built.

The idea of family worship in a square pew does not make the clerical functions the centre of attention any further than prompting or teaching is concerned, and its gross violation of reverence to the altar destroys every principle of the holiness of consecrated places, as it forbids any common right of enjoyment in the whole church by each member of it; it gives each family so much space and no more, and consequently so much feeling of the communion of Christian people as one family suggests, and no more. This theory therefore we notice no further. Next let us consider the somewhat better plan,—of all being placed toward the altar and the ministering Clergy, yet in closed pews. This is so far better, that the congregation looks to one centre of united worship; but still there is the want of freedom we so long for: doors shut in and shut out, give a confined sensation to some, and an excluded one to others. They prevent those present from coming close round what they wish to see and hear, and produce many evils we have been all along attributing to them. Let our readers have pity for those clergymen who have to stretch their voices over a blank space of the church, in order to reach the distant congregation. Not only is power of voice needlessly used in this, so common a case, but the comfortable feeling of addressing a company of listeners gathered round you, is lost in the cold abstraction of merely preaching a sermon from a pulpit.

Digitized by Google

Surely, then, it is a far higher type of Christian worship which is at once suggested by the absence of doors. It is to them that we owe all the distinctive marks of many evils we are now complaining of. We know a clergyman who has long been so impressed with this, that, for years, he has been on the watch to take one door away after another, from the old pews as he could persuade persons to allow him, even at the risk of a very motley appearance in the church. He was unable to restore the church according to a better system of architectural effect, yet he felt that a principle was involved in the doors, which came before any mere considerations of effect. We may also say that his success was very encouraging.

Without doors we may easily imagine a parochial congregation assembling together in perfect freedom, as in the exercise of a common privilege. Take the case of a country parish, where no great hindrances exist, such as must require special provisions to meet, a subject we shall presently consider. This is the highest type of Christian worship; the parochial family all come and join together in the services of their Church, with a real feeling of being therefore pledged to each other, as well as united under one head. Each one feels a property in the use of the whole church, and is only connected with one seat in particular, for the sake of order and propriety in the settling down of the congregation. He may always sit in the same place, or he may not, but from want of a door he attaches no peculiar or individual right to that one place as his own, beyond the preference of habit at the most. This makes a real and a legal difference, the effect of which we may depend on. In Mr. Oliphant's 'Law of Pews,' we find this important passage:—

'The fact of a pew having formerly been open would operate very strongly against any claim to a prescription, because the difference between an open and a closed pew is so strong, that the probability is, that, so soon as the party had ascertained his rights, he would enclose; therefore, Mr. Justice Parke was of opinion that the fact of the seat having formerly been open, destroys the prescription.'

In the freedom of the parochial family thus gathering together, as we now picture it, there is no disorder from the fact that each one feels the whole church his own; the result is rather otherwise, for all, in consequence of this feeling, assemble together in the most natural manner, and scope is given for the exercise of all the courtesies of life, which are indeed so far the rule of the place, that the parochial officers watch with zealous eye any rude infringers of them. When the whole parish in one place meet together for common worship, the natural law is for individuals to be sorted together into classes, young men and young women together, old men and old women the same, while

Digitized by Google

mothers naturally take charge of their little daughters and fathers of their boys, unless schools absorb the children under a peculiar charge. This natural sorting into the classes which life itself points out, is more obvious among the poor than, according to present manners, among the rich; but as the former are the majority, we may surely take their manners as the standard; and where a great advantage is seen to result from them, it is a graceful concession on the part of others to adopt the same practice for the sake of uniformity, though absolute sameness and imperative uniformity on a minor point is not essential even to establish the principle as a general rule. Let it then be a matter of courtesy to place the aged near the clergyman, and to suffer all others to dispose themselves in a free and natural order, curtailing any extravagance on the part of individuals by that authority which the general sense and wisdom of the Church commit to its officers. A regular division of the sexes will naturally follow, as the legitimate mode of authoritatively settling the most natural arrangement of the congregation, as far as the more set and public services of religion are concerned, when all the parish is supposed to be present. To keep this division up at all other times would often be needlessly rigid, and tend to preserve an unwillingness which is often seen to use a part of the church, as, for instance, an aisle or transept, for minor services. In our churches, indeed, where there is but one altar, and that in the chancel, it seems hardly wise to suggest that services should be conducted in the aisles, or smaller parts of the church; for as this one chancel is the natural position of the Clergy in the performance of their offices, it follows that the congregation will always prefer being in front of it, *i. e.* in the nave, if there is room for them. Still there may be catechising of the young, or instruction to the old; in which it would be difficult to adhere to the common places allotted to the sexes, though the same general rule might be adopted, making use, for the time being, of whatever the place might be, to carry out on a small scale what the whole church was on a large one, as we observed to be done in S. Mary Magdalene, where the aisle is for both sexes, north and south of the passage, in the same way as the body.

What we have described as the parochial family assembling together for common prayer and the principal offices of religion, is the Elizabethan type of the Church. Every member of the parish was supposed to be there, on pain of being mulcted to the amount of a shilling. Now where the parish is small, and all are really bound together like a family by mutual compacts of daily life; and also where there is only one clergyman, and he, perhaps, in charge of more churches than one, from the poverty

Digitized by Google

of means, and therefore compelled to appoint his time, and then and there to go through a combination of services; under these circumstances, this theory seems all that can be aimed at; barring the fine, each parishioner must be expected to come to his church at these services, and then, of course, from the sameness of the congregation on every occasion of public worship, each one will have, as it were, his stall, like the members of a corporate body, where he will go as naturally as he occupies his own house when at home, for there will never be any reason for going to a different place.

This theory, however, though exceedingly good as far as it goes, and where it is applicable, yet is obviously not all our Church contemplates, and much of her practical stiffness seems to arise from forcing this one idea down all parishes, with no correction of its evils and deficiencies, even where circumstances do not in the least render them necessary; and still worse, with no allowance for other circumstances, which do not allow its beauties really to develop. The evils and deficiencies we refer to this theory are the paucity of the services, chiefly confined to the Sunday 'combination,' arising from the few Clergy. Where, however, there are more Clergy, who can with perfect convenience have frequent services, it seems an unnecessary hindrance to have a system which implies few services for the whole parish to be present at; which, in fact, does not recognise the utility of service unless the whole surrounding population are supposed to be then and there assembled. The Church has frequent offices, and daily prayers morning and evening, but she does not imagine that all can go on each occasion: yet pews seem to act on this supposition: once however imagine different congregations, it obviously follows that if they place themselves naturally, for whatever service they are present at, their places will not always be the same, but will vary according to many accidental circumstances. The hindrances, again, which militate against the development of the more rural picture we have described, are the result of the fact, that in a district of 10,000 it is impossible to have a place for each individual, whether present or absent, and therefore that there must be a system which allows of the most easy arrangement of those present, without waste of room in allowing for those that are absent. The appropriation system of reserved seats is, therefore, in such a place, directly to the injury of all who have not the same privilege; for, to whatever extent it is carried, so far is a portion of the church abstracted from what undoubtedly is the plan most adapted to the general good. Frequent services, for each of which the whole church is free and open, will thus make the same building far more available to a large population,

Digitized by Google

than the rigid idea represented by our present manner of conducting public worship; and open seats are necessary to foster such a plan, for otherwise our frequent services will not have the change of congregation they are designed for. The many plans for what is called 'dividing the service,' do not come within the province of our present subject, further than the general recommendation we have already expressed; but we wish to commend what seems to us a simple and easy method for commencing an improved system in this respect; and it gave us great pleasure the other day to observe that, in the arrangements announced for the chapel of St. Peter, Pimlico, our ideas were to some extent carried out. In the first place, it is desirable not altogether to throw out the fixed habits of churchgoers by disarranging everything, though, with a view to counteract acknowledged evils, it is perfectly fair to ask of them some moderate concessions. Now early services on Sunday are independent of the habits thus to be considered, and therefore may be commenced with perfect safety. There must be many in London, who, on that their only holyday, might wish to combine their presence at the services of the Church with the relaxation of a little country air. These might attend the early or late services, and still have a long day; whereas at present churchgoing is the day's work, and nothing else can be done. Suppose then early morning prayer at half-past seven, to suit purposes of this kind; and early communion, a short quiet service at half-past eight, adapted for invalids and frequent communicants generally, as well as for those just mentioned; in this case a great number will have gone through their devotions, —will, as it were, have made their use of the church before the larger congregation assembled, leaving also a sufficient interval for weddings and other like offices. The point, however, we are chiefly commending is that of leaving the present order of our services, that is, the Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion Office, with Sermon, so far the same, that persons may, if they wish, remain through them all; but to make such a distinct break that persons may go out or come in. For this purpose there should be a definite time arranged for the commencement of each, and the bell should sound as the immediate signal of the change in the service within the church. Morning Prayer may be announced for half-past 10, Litany for 11, Communion Service for half-past 11. Any interval may well be occupied either by private contemplation or in hymns. The afternoon and evening may be employed in a succession of catechisings, baptisms, &c., and sermons, making each of such ministrations available, as much as possibly, singly by itself, and the appointed ritual of Evening Prayer either once or twice. Private use of

Digitized by Google

churches is thus seen to follow from the free system we have been tracing through its various stages; and it is this general freedom of churches, both for public and private devotion, which we feel sure is the only way of making the same building serve for a large population, and adapt itself to the various classes of age, sex, and position, which make up its numbers.

We have now but a very few words to say, and we have done. If the Church feels any practical difficulties, she naturally looks to her constituted authorities for help in reforming them. On many points it is said that Bishops and Archdeacons can do nothing, if they would; but with the pew system it is not so. The Bishop is the origin of the Churchwardens' power, as well as the ecclesiastical ruler of the Clergy. Surely, then, they may do much in teaching and encouraging Churchwardens to do their duty. Let them point out some plain rules by which they should act, and give them the whole weight of their personal and official authority in carrying them out. It is not to be expected that, in the face of complicated rights, an unassisted Churchwarden can do much, unless of peculiar energy and power; but supported by the Bishop, how quickly would many defenders of selfish claims disappear, and how easy, in comparison, would be the work in each parish, of restoration to a better system! Let Bishops and Archdeacons suggest and urge the correction of pew abuses; let them make all inquiries they can previous to visitation, and enlarge on the subject in their Charges; let them not flinch from fears of unpopularity with the middle classes, for it is their peculiar province to face any prevalent evil, with regard to the Church, from whatever class it comes. Their high position enables them, with peculiar force, to overwhelm vain and grasping claims, to confront absurd or ill-founded prejudices.

Digitized by Google

ART. IV.—*The Record Newspaper.—Report of the Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, May 5.*

WE shall ask our readers to give their attention for a short time to a very remarkable violation of a very common rule of morals. We do not view it with surprise; that is not our feeling; but only as a complete and exact instance of such a violation. A philosopher would regard it with admiration as a specimen. We cannot afford to be so indifferent, but must, in accordance with Christian feeling, express our sorrow that any one who stands before the public as a champion of religious interests, the improver of public morals, and the promoter of benevolent and useful schemes, should be the guilty person in the case. The rule we mean is that which is expressed in the third and fourth verses of the seventh chapter of S. Matthew's Gospel—'Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, 'and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how 'wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of 'thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?"'

On the 5th of May last, Lord Shaftesbury presided at a Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in Exeter Hall, and made a speech from which we extract the following passage:—

'There could be no doubt that in the present day infidelity was assuming a speciousness of form and a cunning of action that had scarcely ever been known in antecedent periods in this or any other country. It rarely happened now, in comparison with former times, that infidelity was propounded, either in speaking or writing, in the same language of coarseness and obscenity, or the same repulsive and disgusting form, as of old. It was now insinuated in a far more dexterous manner. Doubts were very cleverly dropped, and left to fester and rankle in the minds of the hearer. Every kind of sleight-of-hand, every species of adroitness was resorted to, and hundreds and thousands were entrapped by these arts, and became victims of this specious, vile, and diabolical system. In addition to that, they were beset by another danger, by that foul enemy which he would not scruple to name—Tractarianism. Of all the "isms" that ever existed, that was in his mind the most offensive, and, in many respects, the most deceitful and hypocritical. It was singular to remark the tenderness with which Infidelity looked upon Tractarianism, and the tenderness with which Tractarianism looked upon Infidelity; and how they had a common feeling, and a bond of union when set in opposition to Evangelical sentiments, which they looked upon as the great bane of society—the great pest of the present day—simply and solely because it was the only thing that stood in irreconcileable antagonism to that detestable union. No wonder, then, that they exchanged compliments—no wonder, then, that, although they might be careful not to speak in direct approbation of each other, yet, reversing

Digitized by Google

what was said in the Scripture, "He that is not with me is against me," it might be fairly said of these things, "He that is not against Infidelity and against Tractarianism is decidedly with it." '—*The Record*, May 6.

Now, first, with respect to the charge which Lord Shaftesbury brings against—we will for brevity's sake borrow his term—the 'Tractarian' School. It may be quite true that writers of that school have exercised great mildness and forbearance in particular cases of scepticism, where they thought that circumstances warranted and called for such treatment. They have felt for the difficulties and temptations which beset particular minds, and they have seen in the great commotion of thought which characterises the age of the world in which we live, a general predisposing cause to a sceptical temper, which ought to be taken into account in judging individuals. In particular cases, they may even have sympathised with a zeal and enthusiasm of which they lamented the misdirection, and with a devotion to the cause of truth, as the individual supposed it, fatally as he erred in so supposing. It may suit the oratory of the platform to pass a rough and indiscriminating censure upon all opponents; but those who, in the process of forming judgment, bow to an inward sense and conscience, and not to an audience, and who express their opinion according as they themselves after consideration believe, and not according as a roomful of people can without any consideration understand, must act differently. They must make allowance where allowance is to be made, and they must acknowledge and appreciate the good, whatever it may be, that mixes with the evil. Christian charity and Christian policy alike dictate such a course. No one pays attention to another whom he sees not to understand him, not to appreciate his difficulties, or enter into his case: and the coarse judgment is received with a smile by an arrogant antagonist, with disgust by a sincere and zealous one, but with respect by neither. A long career of platform services, however useful and public spirited some may have been, leaves one disadvantageous result behind them, of which, unfair as it may appear, their liberal donor is the victim. His mind becomes too much accustomed to one particular mode of passing judgment, viz. the wholesale one. He thinks no agreement or disagreement real which is not vehement and unqualified, not to say irate. He brings the habits of the platform into his study, and judges books that thoughtful men have written, by that standard. A writer is set down as a crafty traitor, and at heart an infidel. For what reason? He has been guilty of the unpardonable offence of being cool. A distinction here, an admission there, are quite enough to stamp him as a person who is not sincere or hearty on the side on which he professes to write. Lord Shaftesbury may

Digitized by Google

have dipped here and there into 'Tractarian' books, or pamphlets, or reviews, when some sceptical work may have been under comment. He may have seen some sympathy expressed with the sincerity of the author, some pity for his temptations, some appreciation of his talents: and he has, in consequence, immediately set down the writer as not a real disapprover of sceptics; he has inferred some fundamental sympathy between scepticism and 'Tractarianism.' We need not say how controversy would lose by such a standard. Active, and earnest, and deep thinkers on all sides will respect each other *for* that earnest, active, and deep thought, and so far as it is concerned: it is only those who do not think at all that have no respect at all for thought. Even Lord Shaftesbury must in his calmer moments allow that the deepest disagreement may go along with such sympathy, and may be all the better expressed for it. It would be, indeed, a lamentable conclusion to arrive at, that the only test of sincere opposition was virulence, and the true expression of disapprobation, abuse.

So much for one-half of Lord Shaftesbury's charge, viz. 'the tenderness with which Tractarianism looks upon Infidelity.' Into the other half we do not feel ourselves called upon to enter. For 'the tenderness with which Infidelity looks upon Tractarianism,' let Infidels themselves answer; we have nothing to do with their looks, whether they are tender or whether they are severe. We cannot control their opinions either about ourselves or about others. And if it is replied that a favourable opinion from such a quarter is a bad sign, still it is to be proved to what part of the 'Tractarian' it applies, to his creed or to his conduct. We have never heard yet of an infidel who entertained a favourable opinion of the 'Tractarian' creed; he must therefore have been thinking of his conduct, if he entertained such an opinion. But an infidel, if he is only an honest man, may be a fair and competent judge of conduct; that is, he may see that one side is overbearing and abusive, and that another is patient and calm, and he may sympathise with an ill-used party as against those who ill-use them. But, lastly—for there remains another question not wholly irrelevant—do infidels look tenderly upon 'Tractarians?' Lord Shaftesbury brings no evidence, and till he brings some, we shall beg leave to doubt a fact which he has so boldly stated.

But what is the position which Lord Shaftesbury himself occupies, when he brings this charge against the 'Tractarians,' of an alliance with scepticism? In what company is he himself when he makes it? That, and not the charge itself—about which, on its own account, we should not have troubled

Digitized by Google

ourselves to speak—is the point to which we call attention. There is that specimen of moral blindness and obliquity, of a man accusing others and doing the very same thing himself, which we have thought so curious, so valuable, and so instructive, as to deserve a distinct notice in this Review.

He brings this charge while he himself is acting publicly in company and concert with a very distinguished and accomplished sceptic; acting with him not for any object of secular utility for which men of all religious sentiments may without reproach combine, but for a strictly religious object—the spread of religious truth, the dissemination of the Bible. It is, while receiving such a sceptic for a religious ally, acknowledging him as a brother, putting him forward as a supporter and patron of a religious cause,—it is with the Chevalier Bunsen on his right hand, on the platform of the Bible Society, that he brings this charge.

In attaching this epithet to the Chevalier Bunsen, we do not mean to pronounce any personal censure upon him. He may simply have imbibed the tone of society in which he has been brought up on such subjects. He may even have—and we give him credit for it—a sincere desire to raise the tone of German society on such subjects. His wish, however qualified, for an alliance between the English and German communions through the medium of the episcopacy, may have had that motive. In calling him a sceptic, we only mean to say that his opinions on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture, stated to any ordinary Churchman or even dissenter in this country, would be considered sceptical opinions. He takes a licence in his treatment of the Bible, from which Christian society in this country would shrink as fatal to the *bonâ fide* reception of that book as an inspired one, the word of God; considering that, with respect to historical facts, even those most intimately connected with the scheme of man's redemption, it may be in error, and that its information is not to be depended on. That he may reconcile such want of inspiration in the matter of history, with a certain inspired substance or central truth contained in it, in his own mind, we can easily believe; but we say, nevertheless, that such a want of inspiration as he attributes to Scripture in the field of history, would be considered a sceptical conclusion by ordinary religious society in this country. We will give, by way of illustration, two instances, one a less and the other a more important one—if on so serious a subject we can admit degrees of importance—of his method of treating Scripture history.

It is stated in Exodus xii. 40, that 'the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and

'thirty years.' And in Genesis xv. 13, a prophecy is stated to have been made, during the lifetime of Abraham, and to that patriarch, announcing that period as the time that such sojourn would last, the only difference being that in the prophecy the round number of four centuries is given, in the historical relation, the specific number of four hundred and thirty years. Now this period of four hundred and thirty years does not suit the Chevalier Bunsen's chronological system, as gathered by him from the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Accordingly, he treats it as a mistake of the inspired writer. In the absence of eminent names during the sojourn in Egypt, and consequently of a genealogical basis on which to determine the length of this sojourn, the inspired writer is supposed to have adopted the summary method of doubling the patriarchal period. The patriarchal period, including the lives of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was 215 years: the historian knew that the period of the sojourn in Egypt was longer than that, but he did not know how much longer. As a convenient mode, therefore, of settling the point, he supposed it to be twice as long; that is to say, 430 years. Such is the treatment of the sacred narrative; that of the prophecy corresponds. The prophecy is supposed to have been made 'somewhat earlier or *later*, for this is doubtful,' than the event to which it related, viz. the termination of the sojourn in Egypt.[1] That is to say, the statement which the Bible says was prophetical, the Chevalier Bunsen says was not.

The other instance of the Chevalier Bunsen's treatment of the historical Scriptures is a more important one, involving, as it does, a whole set of facts, intimately connected with the scheme of man's redemption, its promise, its type, the family selected as the instrument of its fulfilment, and appealed to constantly throughout the New Testament, with such reference. The sacrifice of Isaac was the significant type of that higher sacrifice which God the Father made in sending His only Son into the world to suffer death upon the cross for man's redemption. The Messiah is declared throughout Scripture to be the veritable seed of Abraham. The relation, then, in which the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob stand to one another and to the Jewish nation, is an important fact in Scripture history. Nevertheless, the Chevalier Bunsen destroys it, coming, as it does, into collision with his chronological system. To Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob he allows a personal existence, but without a family relationship. 'The genealogy of the chosen friend of 'God is historically to be looked upon as exhibiting great and 'long-enduring commotions of the old population of Asia; it

[1] Christian Remembrancer, vol. xii. p. 300.

Digitized by Google

'represents the relation of tribes to each other, not personal 'relations of father and son.' And the genealogy of Abraham, as M. Bunsen uses the term, includes his posterity as well as his forefathers, for he includes in it Abraham's posterity by Keturah; adding, that 'any one who still wishes not to see 'with regard to these names, that they are the names of tribes 'not of persons, will here, through the plural form of the names, 'be compelled to acknowledge that he is in the presence of 'traditions as to the connexion of tribes of people.' In the midst of this great province of names, representing tribes, he makes, indeed, an exception in favour of the three patriarchs, so far as to suppose that they were not tribes but persons; an exception of which, while we admire the spirit, we must confess an entire inability to understand the rationale. But their personality is all which is allowed; their relationship, and with it the whole affecting narrative of facts supposing it, as well as their bearing upon the scheme of the gospel, falls to the ground. Indeed it has been observed, that of the whole history of Abraham, upon M. Bunsen's plan, only one chapter is retained as true, viz. that in which he fights with four kings of Canaan for the delivery of Lot. And by a strange coincidence, that remarkable German critic, M. Ewald, selects the same chapter for unqualified approval, as 'an account of inestimable value;' the value apparently lying mainly in the circumstance that it is considered 'wholly at variance with all other accounts.' Thus Abraham 'appears like Eshkol and Mamre, with whom 'he stands in a mutual defensive alliance, as the head of a 'mighty house of Canaan—he wages war, an act not even 'distantly hinted at in the older Mosaic documents, as not 'being suitable to a prophet and holy man in the Mosaic 'view.'

But M. Bunsen's responsibility extends beyond his own particular written opinions and conclusions. We do not say that for a man to praise those who go all lengths on any question, is exactly the same thing as going those lengths himself. But we do say that it is a very grave additional responsibility which he undertakes. And when such praise is given with warmth and earnestness, when it is applied not to any general talents or endowments of mind which the other may show, but to his services on the particular subject, it is difficult to believe that the commender can object heartily even to the very lengths to which the other carries his speculation, and that he does not agree fundamentally with him. We have just mentioned a remarkable German theological critic, M. Ewald, the author of a book called a 'History of the People of Israel.' Of the principles on which M. Ewald deals with Scripture, his general view of inspiration, we may form some idea when we

Digitized by Google

learn that he has adopted it as an axiom that 'a passage seemingly containing prophecy' is of the date of the event of 'which it speaks.' Thus the authors of the prophecy of Jacob, of the prophecy of Moses, and of the prophecy of Balaam, are placed respectively in the time of the Judges, in the reign of Josiah, and in the reign of Uzziah or Jotham. These writers are called 'prophetic relators of history,' and their predictions are considered to belong to a peculiar style of authorship. On a similar principle of criticism the author of the book of Deuteronomy is placed very late, viz. 'in the second half of the reign of king Manasseh,' the reason for the assignment of so late a date being that the book of Deuteronomy itself states that it was written by Moses' own hand. M. Ewald sees in such an assertion 'a boldness of historical assumption' which only belongs to the later ages of history. 'Such an assumption,' he remarks, 'is certainly one of the many signs of the 'later date of this writer, who, on the very ground that he felt 'himself to be at such a distance from the time of Moses, gave 'the freest play to the mode of looking upon and treating history.' Such a mode of treating history is indeed a very free one, being no less than the assertion that something took place which never did.

It can be no wonder if on such principles of criticism the whole of the early Bible history melts into mist and darkness; if the prevailing character of the Bible relations is declared to be unhistorical; if the patriarchs are supposed to stand at the head of a series of ideal pictures, analogous to the heroes as distinct from the gods of heathen antiquity; the juxtaposition of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob being compared to the triad of Agamemnon Achilles and Ulysses, on which the Iliad, and that of Anchises Æneas and Ascanius, on which the old tale of Troy, the basis of the Æneid, turns. Nor can it be any matter of surprise if from the age of heroes we ascend to that of gods, and on passing from patriarchal into antediluvian times, meet with two demigoddesses in the wives of Lamech, Ada and Zillah, with Janus, or the modern Yanacea, in the person of Enoch, with Mars in the person of Methuselah, with Apollo in that of Mahalaleel, with the river-god, or the Indian Varuna, in that of Jared. The critic does not indeed impose these analogies dictatorially upon his readers, but only as the most reasonable conjectures he can form, considering the great difficulties under which his inquiry is conducted. 'Our inquiry,' he says, 'into this period is rendered the more difficult, because 'with very slight exceptions our only source is the Bible.' Abandoned, however, to so poor (as he imagines) an authority or guide, he has made the most of his resources; for no sagacity less than that of an acute German critic could, by the light of

Scripture principally, have discovered such remarkable analogies. Moreover he considers that however obscure the source, some truths, even of an historical kind, may be drawn from Scripture. 'Although,' says M. Ewald, 'we cannot here own very much so 'securely as we could wish, as pure history, yet at least some 'strictly historical truths of importance do come up, the more 'welcome out of that distant sea of fog, so soon as we are 'adequately qualified to see them right.'[1]

After settling who the patriarchs themselves were, M. Ewald settles their religion; which was, according to him, polytheistic in its bias. It had, indeed, a monotheistic element, which 'Mosaism' afterwards took up and developed, but the element was then but a partial one. The monotheism of the patriarchs was a local and a domestic monotheism; there was no more than one god for one place, or for one family; but another place and another family might have another god. The god of the three patriarchs was one god in relation 'to their rule, which was simply domestic,' he was 'essentially a single family-god.' He 'was conceived of indeed with strict morality, and in con-'trast with any degraded conceptions.' But 'such a domestic 'god, however elevated were the conceptions of him, admitted 'of other gods together with himself, for other houses or other 'men, and accordingly was in no way a security against poly-'theism.' Indeed 'that God in the time before Moses was 'conceived of with this idea of indefinite extension and possible 'divisiblitiy, the standing use of the plural elohim proves '(especially as compared with the corresponding teraphim, '*penates*). The oldest tale itself proves this, in that in an 'oath it makes Jacob and Laban call upon the God of Abraham 'and the God of Nahor as two different gods.' The two altars built respectively to the 'God of Bethel,' and 'God, the God of Israel,' prove the same. Thus 'together with the chief god, the house-god of the chief, a hero-pantheon was formed;' and 'there was wanting to the One God of the patriarchs all 'the more precise definiteness and sharp severance of the 'Mosaic God.'[2]

Such is the critic of whose labours the Chevalier Bunsen thus speaks:—'The first part of Ewald's History of the People 'of Israel has appeared; a work which we look upon as the 'beginning of a truly historical corrected research into this 'ever-memorable portion of the history and its sources, and 'hail with glowing thankfulness as an honourable memorial of 'German learning and historical science.' 'Oh for the earnest 'and sifting eye of Ewald!'

So much for the opinions of M. Bunsen himself, and the

[1] Christian Remembrancer, vol. xii. p. 311. [2] Ibid. p. 415.

Digitized by Google

opinions of those whom he admires. We may add, on the authority of a correspondent in the *Record*, that these opinions of his have already excluded him from the platform of two societies, of whose impartial estimate of him, and strong reluctance to take such a step, nobody can doubt—the London Missionary Society, and the Religious Tract Society.

Can Lord Shaftesbury then show cause why the rebuke which we quoted from the Gospel of S. Matthew should not be addressed to him—'Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?' If Lord Shaftesbury has not placed himself within the legitimate compass of that rebuke, no one ever has, and no one ever will do so. With a writer who openly knocks down the inspiration of Scripture whenever it suits his own theories, with a most distinguished sceptic, by his side, he dares to accuse another party of an alliance with scepticism. It is not we, but the very letter of Scripture which rebukes him, and which proceeds to rebuke him further, and to combine with its rebuke advice:—'Thou 'hypocrite! first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and 'then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy 'brother's eye.'

But we have not yet done. The 'Tractarian party,' which Lord Shaftesbury accuses of an alliance with scepticism, has one eminent member, who is so far, to the popular eye, in the position of a leader, that his name has been given to it. Now it so happens, that just six years ago an elaborate letter appeared in this very Review, with the initials of that eminent person appended to it, warning the religious world of the opinions of M. Bunsen, their contradiction to the Inspiration of Scripture, and so to the very foundation of Christian belief. We have referred to it throughout this article. That letter must have caused no small pain to its writer, for, if we mistake not, it was written at the cost of many private friendly recollections of the distinguished person whom he thought it a public religious duty to oppose. It was a letter marked with all the care and earnestness for which its writer is so remarkable, with all his fulness of proof, reference, and quotation. The work of M. Bunsen, 'Egypt's Position in the History of the World,' which had then recently become known in this country, was regularly entered into, examined and laid bare; all that portion of it, that is, which related to the Bible history, and its inspiration. Society was solemnly warned against audacious speculation upon sacred ground, against all tampering with the Bible, against the inroads of Scepticism and Infidelity. So far, then, as that writer represents 'Tractarians,' and we may add, so far as

Digitized by Google

this Review, in which his letter appeared, represents them, 'Tractarians,' so far from allying themselves with Infidelity, have, on the contrary, been the very first to oppose it; the first to discover it when it came under specious disguises, and under the authority of an eminent name, which might have blinded the ignorant and careless. So far from entrapping others, on the contrary, they first warned others of the snare; warned them when they did not see it, and might in consequence have fallen into it. We leave it to the impartial bystander to determine which is the ally of the sceptic, he who discovers and convicts him, or he who, after he has been discovered and convicted, openly unites with and hails him upon a religious ground as a brother; the 'Tractarian,' or Lord Shaftesbury.

The rebuke, then, which was just now addressed to Lord Shaftesbury, was, indeed, a too indulgent one; it assumed a higher state of morals in the offender, than we can admit in his Lordship. For the rebuke supposes that the offender, in speaking ill of his neighbour, speaks the truth about him, only that he is a hypocrite to speak it, when he himself is just as bad, and should therefore hold his tongue. But Lord Shaftesbury has not yet learned those rudiments of morals which the Gospel text supposes even in the hypocrite. He comes under the Jewish law, before the Gospel has a word to say to him—an offender against the ninth commandment of the Decalogue, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.' When the Jewish law has rebuked him as a calumniator, and he has mended that fault, he has a title to be brought under the Gospel count of hypocrisy; but as yet he is not sufficiently advanced for it. A man is fit for reproof on a higher and more refined ground, when he has profited by reproof on a lower and simpler one, but not till then. It would be wasted on him; it would be casting pearls before swine. When Lord Shaftesbury has learned the simple duty of speaking the truth, he will be ripe for instruction in the deeper one of knowing when he has the right to speak it. He may unlearn hypocrisy when he has ceased to be a slanderer. But he is not likely to unlearn it before. Meantime, we shall watch any amendment which we may discern from time to time in him, with that satisfaction which we ought to feel when a man, who has been a long time employed, and most honourably and usefully, in improving society, begins at last to think of improving himself. We shall rejoice to see, of the two characters which he at present owns by accumulation, even one dropped, and still more, if that release prepares for the other; as, indeed, it will probably do. Veracity about others will lead in return to knowledge of himself. And when Lord Shaftesbury speaks the truth of others,

Digitized by Google

and knows himself and his own position, he will not accuse the 'Tractarians' of an alliance with scepticism, and certainly will not do so in company with the Chevalier Bunsen.

Whilst we were at press, indeed when most of the foregoing sheets were worked off, Dr. Pusey's important 'Letter to Lord Shaftesbury' appears in the *Morning Chronicle* of June 26. Dr. Pusey, as our whole argument has urged, is not only specially aggrieved by this slander of Lord Shaftesbury, but has shown, on an occasion when Revelation was particularly assailed, and that by his own friend, that on him that slander falls with the least effect. For either reason his remonstrance is most important. He, at any rate, has a peculiar right to speak. Whether Lord Shaftesbury, after disregarding private warnings of so touching a character as Dr. Pusey alludes to, will still retain his supercilious disregard of truth and decency, remains to be seen. To complete the case, however, as far as it has at present gone, we reprint Dr. Pusey's letter from the *Morning Chronicle*:—

'My dear Lord Shaftesbury—In writing to you publicly, on account of a statement which you made some time past, as to "the tenderness with which Tractarians look upon infidelity," and "the organs of infidelity upon Tractarianism," let me, in the first place, assure you that I would not speak or think one word or thought unkindly towards yourself. I have looked with interest upon all your exertions in behalf of the poor, whether in Parliament, or through private institutions. Every Christian must be thankful for whatever is done, directly or indirectly, to raise any of our degraded poor, or bring them to the knowledge of our Redeemer.

'Nor do I ask for any personal explanation as to myself. Your charge was quite general. It alluded specially to no one, but, on that very account, it included all. It was reported thus:—"They [Christians, now] were beset by another danger—by that foul enemy which he would not scruple to name—Tractarianism. Of all the 'isms' that ever existed, that was in his mind the most offensive, and in many respects the most deceitful and hypocritical. It was singular to remark the tenderness with which infidelity looked upon Tractarianism, and the tenderness with which Tractarianism looked upon infidelity; and how they had a common feeling, and a bond of union, when set in opposition to Evangelical sentiments, which they looked upon as the great bane of society—the great pest of the present day—simply and solely because it was the only thing that stood in irreconcilable antagonism to that detestable union. No wonder, then, that they exchanged compliments," &c.

'I did not believe, until you yourself informed me that these words were substantially correct, that any human being could have brought such a

Digitized by Google

charge as this. Accustomed as my friends have been for nearly twenty years to all sorts of misconception and misrepresentation, I never met with anything like this. I know not whether you used the word Tractarian in the narrower sense of those who wrote the "Tracts for the Times," a publication closed about eleven years ago, or in the larger sense of those who, in main principles, agree with them. In either case, I know that (although unconsciously, of course, to yourself) *your lordship's statement is absolutely and entirely untrue.* If you took the word Tractarian in its narrowest sense, it might be enough to remind you who are the chief surviving writers of the "Tracts for the Times," with one only exception, who has been lost to the Church of England. And of the remaining writers, not of him, you must have been speaking, since you were speaking of the Church of England. The chief remaining contributors, then, are the two Mr. Kebles, Mr. Isaac Williams, and myself. I would appeal to yourself, my dear lord, to find one sentence in any of our writings during this whole period which should give you the slightest plea for any such statement as this. If you took the word Tractarian in the wider sense, you must necessarily include in it some of the most valued and thoughtful defenders of our common faith, whose names I will not unite with such a name of reproach as Tractarians.

'Your lordship's statement is threefold: 1. (to drop the abstract term, since Tractarianism can have no existence independent of its writers,) that "Tractarians look with tenderness upon infidelity;" and this, 2. out of "opposition to Evangelicalism;" and this not in itself, but, 3. "because it is the only irreconcilable antagonist to the union" between Tractarianism and infidelity.

'1. I have already written to you in private that "I cannot even imagine what plea you can have for this dreadful charge." Tenderness for individuals, who are unhappily perplexed about their faith, or have lost it, all must have who believe that our Lord died for all, and that even these may be won back to Him. But your charge is, that "Tractarianism looks with tenderness," not upon infidels, but "upon infidelity." I can conceive, as I have said to you, that persons might say that infidelity might come as a reaction from "the Catholic faith," *i. e.* that persons who would not receive it, would, if not allowed any compromise, adopt infidelity in preference. I can understand its being said that people "drive others to infidelity" (as they speak) by the claims which "the Catholic faith" makes upon human reason. But I cannot understand how any writers, teaching (*as the writers of the Tracts did*) that Holy Scripture is implicitly to be believed—that it is the source of all faith and truth; that it is to be understood in the sense in which it was always understood by the Church from the time of the Apostles; that the human mind is implicitly to submit to authority—can be supposed to have any leanings towards infidelity. The first principle on the one side is the submission, or, as Archbishop Howley said, "the prostration of the human understanding" before the revealed will of God; that of the other, of course, its uncontrolled sway.

Digitized by Google

'2. Your second charge is, that this tenderness to infidelity arises, in fact, out of a blind hatred to Evangelicalism as "the great bane of society, the great pest of the present day." I need only appeal to any of the writings of the persons whom I have named, or to their personal history, to show this to be untrue. I know it to have been the uniform desire of those writers, and of every other whom I know, who would be entitled a Tractarian, (as it has been my own,) to point out, both in public and in private, what we have in common with Evangelicalism—to seek out (where we were permitted) those called Evangelicals—to confer with them, remove prejudice and misunderstanding when we could, to seize on every point of approximation, to recognise, in their teaching, all which we believed to be true. We have wished, not so much to oppose Evangelicalism, as to supply its defects. All its positive teaching almost is ours too. We have looked upon it as a maimed exhibition of the Gospel, teaching nakedly certain truths, and leaving others out of sight. We have wished to teach all the fundamental truths which it, too, teaches, and to supply what was wanting to it. I know, too, that to a very great extent, this our endeavour has been blessed. Prejudices have disappeared, misunderstandings have been cleared, when people ventured to become acquainted either with Tractarians, or with their writings. I believe that, in proportion as we love one another, we shall understand one another. For the glow of love draws up those mists which hinder people from seeing each other, or the truth clearly, and mostly refract and distort the form of both.

'3. It is more shocking than the rest to have to deny the last charge, that the ground of opposition to "Evangelical sentiments" is, that they are antagonistic to the union of Tractarianism with infidelity. I believe that the "opposition" has, for the most part, been that of defence—explanation against attacks. But, in as far as any of us have written controversially, it has not been—God forbid!—against any of the blessed truths which enter into the Evangelical system, but against its denials, direct or indirect, of other truths of the Gospel.

'I agree with you, and have felt these twenty-seven years (ever since I became acquainted with German), that the faith in England would have to go through a fiery trial in conflict with infidelity. It was impressed upon me in the study of the history of rationalism then, that neither a dry orthodoxy, nor Evangelicalism, could stand against it. Pietism began as fervently as the early Evangelicalism. Some of its early members were learned. But in the next generation it degenerated, for the most part, and was swept away by the flood of infidelity. I believe that none of my friends have failed to be alive to this evil of rationalism; and part of the offence which we have given has been that we discerned rationalism in the minds and systems of Zwingli and Calvin. We may not have used armour which you wished, or may have used arms which you, on your side, would mistrust. It is true that I did once decline your wish that I should write against a work which was attracting some notice, and which we both believed to be

Digitized by Google

mischievous. I forget upon what ground. I imagine that I had more immediate and pressing personal duties. For we have to learn in life that we cannot, intellectually also, do what we would: life passes away, while things which we would do even for the glory of God remain undone. Or I may have thought that anything which I could do in that direction, I could, with God's help, do much better by teaching truth positively than by writing against another's book. I asked you to apply to your "friends the Evangelicals," not as thinking that the task especially belonged to them, but wishing that they would bear part of the burden and heat of the day, instead of wasting our time and strength by their controversies against us, and misrepresentations of our faith.

'I wrote most of this privately to you more than a month ago, and I expressed "my hope that your statements may have been much misrepresented," and my conviction that, if it was so, "you would wish publicly to correct it." You think this unreasonable. I have asked you again to think whether it is "unreasonable, when an unfounded and heavy charge of indifference to Christianity itself, in a blind hatred against a popular system of it, is brought against a body of fellow-Christians, more or fewer, and those bound by our holy calling, as well as by our common faith, to maintain and teach the blessed Gospel"—is it unreasonable in one of those accused to ask you publicly to correct the statement?

'"In another" (I have written to you privately) "one might have passed it by as a shocking calumny. But when one who, like yourself, stands forward as the advocate of religious truth, makes such a statement, it may take its place among the popular impressions of the day. The gainer, I believe, by all these unseemly imputations, is not the cause you would wish to see prosper, but that very infidelity. For if we were such as you represent us, we should have been half infidels ourselves. And nothing outwardly so disposes to unbelief as the impression that those who profess to be Christians do not believe, or are indifferent to, what they profess."

'I do then again call upon you, not as a matter personal to myself, yet, as having some right to do so, as being included among those of whom you spoke—I call upon you, in the name of our common Christianity, of our one Lord and Redeemer, to re-consider the charge which you have made, and if you find that you were, in speaking, hurried beyond your deliberate conviction, or beyond what you had adequate grounds for saying, to unsay it as publicly as you said it. Surely you cannot persist in what you are warned (although, of course, you did not intend it) is a false accusation, contrary to every principle, feeling, desire, to the whole faith and being of those against whom you made it.

'Yours faithfully, E. B. PUSEY.'

'*Christ Church, June* 23.'

Digitized by Google

ART. V.—1. *Miss Sellon and the 'Sisters of Mercy.' An Exposure of the Constitution, Rules, Religious Views, and Practical Working of their Society; obtained through a Sister who has recently seceded.* By the Rev. JAMES SPURRELL, A.M., *Vicar of Great Shelford, Cambridgeshire.* London: Hatchards.

2. *Reply to a Tract by the* Rev. J. SPURRELL, *containing certain Charges concerning the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth.* By the SUPERIOR OF THE SOCIETY. London: Masters.

3. *A Letter to Miss Sellon, Superior of the Society of Sisters of Mercy, at Plymouth.* By HENRY, *Lord Bishop of Exeter.* London: Murray.

4. *A Rejoinder to the Reply of the Superior of the Society of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth, to a Pamphlet entitled, 'Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy:' by the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M.* By the same. London: Hatchards.

5. *A Letter to the Rev. James Spurrell, A.M.* By A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE. London: Masters.

6. *Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Misery; or, Miss Sellon in the Family.* By the Rev. W. M. COLLIS, A.B., *Curate of Melton Mowbray.* London: Hatchards.

7. *Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy. Further Statement of the Rules, Constitution, and Working of the Society called 'The Sisters of Mercy,' together with an exact Review of Miss Sellon's Reply.* By DIANA A. G. CAMPBELL, *a Novice lately seceded.* London: Hatchards.

THE reader will conjecture, from the list of books placed at our heading, what subject the next few pages will offer to his attention. Our notice of it shall be as short as possible, for more than one reason. In the first place, the acts of—if we may use the expression without offence to the Superior of the Sisterhood at Devonport—a young lady, are not usual material for the pages of a Review. We criticise the lady as authoress, when she comes out as such: we have seldom to do with her as actor. Any comment, therefore, upon her in that capacity is made at a great disadvantage. It is made at the expense of those natural feelings which, under ordinary circumstances, erect a barrier between her and the public: and the writer of the comment feels the effect of an unfavourable position, and anticipates his

reader's observation of it. There are other reasons why such a task is not an agreeable one.

We submit cheerfully, then, to a disadvantageous position. At the same time we must add, in justice to ourselves, that we could not have avoided it. What all the world talks about, a review is expected to notice. If no notice appears, the charge is made of negligence or cowardice. Whatever responsibility, therefore, there may be in bringing the acts of a zealous and noble-minded lady under public comment, belongs to the world at large, and not to ourselves. We can give no more publicity to the subject than it already possesses.

But after apologizing for commenting upon Miss Sellon's proceedings at all, we have next to apologize for the circumstance, that that comment will not be one of unmixed approval. We deeply regret this, more especially as we cannot but fear that some, for whose opinion we entertain a high respect, will consider such absence of entire and simple approval, as very misplaced in this quarter, and will make the remark, if not to others, at least to themselves, that we had better have said nothing, than said what did not amount to that.

To begin, then, with some remarks addressed to persons who have these feelings,—remarks on the general subject of criticism; for the objection they entertain falls under this general head.

A strong objection, then, is sometimes felt to criticism in one particular case, by persons who adopt a high and refined, though, perhaps, an over-tender and sensitive standard of humility. The case supposed is that in which a person of extraordinary Christian attainments and gifts, great self-denial and great spirituality of mind, is the subject of criticism. Such persons happily there are, in all ages of the world, and sometimes their schemes and labours bring them prominently before the public eye. In such cases, that is to say, where positive action is before us in the shape of objects pursued and undertakings carried on, there is necessarily room for criticism. But unhappily, the great body of those who have to form the judgment in such a case, are not of this extraordinary Christian stamp. Numbers of them may be good conscientious persons, doing their duty in that station of life in which Providence has placed them; but the many are necessarily ordinary. There is, therefore, in the present case, the ordinary Christian sitting as judge, while the extraordinary one appears before him to undergo judgment. Such a state of things, say these persons, is an anomalous and improper one; and they recommend in such a case the suspension of the operation of the critical faculty. It is not, they argue, for commonplace Christians to be forming a judgment upon those who are infinitely their superiors in self-denial, loftiness, and spirituality

of life. They cannot comprehend their motives, or appreciate their aims. They judge them by some mixed, half Christian, half worldly, standard which they have adopted for themselves, and forget that that very standard incapacitates them for such a task. It is for such to put their minds into an attitude of respect simply. They cannot assume the critical office without offending against the first law of humility.

It must be admitted that this is, within certain limits, a very natural and just line of thought; nor is there, perhaps, any Clergyman of a parish, schoolmaster, or parent, who has not to fall back upon it as a basis of discipline, and a check to presumption and impertinence. But the absolute rule, that no inferior is ever to judge the conduct of a superior, is such an exaggeration of the natural law, as cannot, either in the department of reason or of practice, support the test of sober examination.

For let the persons who urge such a rule only consider what it involves in every judgment whatever made by one man upon another. We presume that they allow, in the first instance, that the power of forming a judgment upon man's character and conduct, was not implanted in us for no object whatever, but was intended for use. But what is the preliminary position which this rule makes essential for the performance of any act of judgment upon another, the inseparable condition of any use whatever of the faculty? It obliges him to say that he thinks himself morally and spiritually better than the person who is the subject of judgment. Now it is, in the first place, questionable, if we insist upon strict right, whether any one man has a right to say absolutely that he is better than any other: for, however reasonable a conjecture he may form, he cannot know it as a fact; and till he knows it as a fact, he had better abstain from asserting it. And in that case the present rule would act immediately as a universal prohibitor and suppressor of the act of judgment in man. But allowing for the right of formal self-preference in particular instances of comparison, in which an enormous and extreme moral disparity was apparent,—a very wide field would still be left in which the judgment would remain prohibited from exertion. For certainly no man has a right positively to assert himself to be better than another, except it is a very clear case—so clear as that there could be no disagreement about it among impartial judges of any class. Apparent difference of degree in goodness, where both belonged to the general class of good characters, even considerable difference, would be far from a sure basis for such a decision. And therefore the whole class of good men of all kinds, all well-disposed and respectable society, would be disqualified on this rule for forming any judgment upon conduct and character

within their sphere. But lastly, even could we imagine the right to exist, and to a large extent, still the exertion of it is so invidious and so opposed to delicacy, modesty, and taste, that no right-minded person can bring himself to it. A higher law than that of justice interferes to prevent him. So here is a rule, according to which the only passage to the exercise of a certain faculty is made one which no well-disposed mind can take; a rule by which an act of judgment is thrown back upon a basis of presumption, no other being equal to supporting it.

But to the inconsistency of such a rule in reason, we must add some most injurious effects in practice. First, the effect is most injurious as regards the persons themselves whom it thus lifts above all the reach of criticism. There cannot be a more dangerous temptation, even to the highest and most spiritual minds, than the offer of such an unguarded and unchecked deference—a deference which tells them that with respect to them the reason has given up its natural functions; that they have nothing to do but to follow out their own ideas as they please, and that they are sure to be right. It was never intended that man should enjoy such a position as this. There is no despotism in morals. Every one, however high be his character and rank spiritual, should be considered under the jurisdiction of the moral and religious part of the community, so far as that they may call him to account for what he does, and examine and decide upon it, whether it is right or wrong. If persons are encouraged to regard the community as beneath them, they are put in a false position; and so far as their own minds accept this position, they receive moral harm. The general sense of mankind is the proper constitutional check upon the caprices and impetuosity of the individual; and if he throws it off, he deprives himself of a providential discipline. Moreover, such an elevation of the individual is very injurious as an example. It awakens the vanity of many a religious beginner. He aspires to a position which he sees placed before him as the reward of zeal and activity, and he is no sooner an aspirant than he forestalls the goal, and enjoys all the sentiment of such a position long before he has done anything to gain it. So true is it, that where persons are not content with a virtue as nature has made it, they first spoil, and finally destroy it. The rule which we have been considering begins with an undue claim upon humility, and ends in the greatest encouragement to pride. There is first an exaggeration, and then a fall. The reason is deprived of its functions in order to deepen humility, and the result is a great snare to that very virtue, in the creation of a post too high for man,—as great a scandal and an offence as one man can put in another's path. It may be said, indeed, that

the mass are the gainers, though at the expense of those whom it elevates; for that the humility of the mass is not impaired by the arrogant use made of it by the few. But no one can seriously imagine that one party can be benefited by what is an undue scandal to the other. We are all one body, and what injures one is sooner or later injurious to the rest. If a certain form of the virtue of humility is found not to work well in the body, but to produce mischief upon strictly natural principles, then that form, we may depend upon it, is not the true and proper form of that virtue, but is an artificial form of it, invented by man, and therefore not a sound and proper humility even in those who exhibit it.

But it is of comparatively slight consequence, except to themselves, that some individuals should either in whole or in part lose the grace of humility. It is of great consequence, indeed, to all, that the moral sense of mankind should be preserved in integrity. But this rule, could we imagine it really in operation, would ultimately deprave and corrupt the moral sense of mankind. An act of judgment upon any proceeding of another is nothing but an exertion of the moral sense. Whenever an action takes place, it either agrees or disagrees with our idea of what is right. The perception of this agreement or disagreement by a person is his judgment. Whether he expresses it or not, if he definitely perceives it, he judges: the right of expression following upon the first principles of reason. This being the case, it is evident that if men cease to exert such judgment as we are speaking of, they cease to exert their moral sense. On coming across such and such phenomena of conduct which come before it, this faculty gives way and does not perform its functions: it is suppressed in deference to the same faculty in some other person. Now, remember, that in the present instance the party suppressing its moral sense is the community, the one whose sense is deferred to, the individual. The general result follows, that the moral sense of mankind at large is accommodated to that of individuals; made to coincide with the individual's in its whole scope and direction. But are individuals safe standards? Is it right to entrust to their keeping and control the moral sense of mankind? Certainly not: not even the noblest, wisest, and best are to be so far trusted. The individual's sense is partial and distorted; the body's alone is large and proportioned. The individual is soon exhausted, soon absorbed: the very attention to one duty often withdraws him from another, and in withdrawing him from it practically, lessens even his perception of it. He is entirely occupied in some limited field of labour, and thinks that the whole world; his narrowness makes him eager, his eagerness makes him

Digitized by Google

narrow. Does he set his mind on some work? All other considerations must give way. The idea of relative importance, of comparison of interests, of balance and adjustment, goes. He runs into obliquities and extravagances. All this is necessary, because the individual is the individual, and not the body,—a fractional, a small being. Commit the control and moulding then of the moral sense of mankind to individuals, and what must ensue? The moral sense of mankind will become partial and distorted. A change will take place like the great diluvial revolutions which geologists describe. Some whole tracts of duty will disappear, enormous new ones will be cast up. Some important moral rules will be forgotten entirely, others will domineer; and a capricious and artificial idea of right or wrong will supersede the natural one.

Indeed we have here the true direct answer to the rule, that no inferior in character must judge a superior. It is quite true, that no superior ought to be judged by an inferior on those points on which he is the superior, and has the better and truer perceptions of the two. But it does not follow that a person, who is superior, on the whole, in his perceptions of duty to another, is superior on every point. A person of inferior perceptions to him generally may have a superior perception, to his, of some one or other particular duty. The very possession of a more intense and earnest mind, will cause a too small estimate of some duties, as it will a too large one of others. And where an estimate is wrong, it may be corrected by another mind whose estimate is better.

There is another consideration. We have been supposing here all along that the extraordinary Christian, the one who makes some remarkable sacrifices of a tangible and distinct kind, and adopts a peculiar plan of life, *is* superior to an ordinary Christian; meaning by that term, one who mixes with the main body, and has no external peculiarity. But it is obvious, that such an assumption as this must be largely modified, if it is to be made consistent with truth. This is so old a topic, that we need only touch on it. It is obvious to any one, who is an observer of character at all, that many persons who adopt no peculiar external plan of life, are better persons than some who do. The circumstance of making distinct tangible sacrifices, is no absolute test of superiority. The Christian character may be more deeply seated in one who has not made this class of sacrifices, than in one who has. And if the body of ordinary Christians contains, as it unquestionably does, such characters as these, we ought to be careful how we depreciate the judgment of that body.

If this whole line of remark on the situation of individuals,

Digitized by Google

and their amenableness to criticism, be true, we will add, that they are not inopportune in the peculiar circumstances of the Church to which we belong. There have been always parties in the Christian Church, for there have always been differences of opinion within the Church. But our branch of the Church has been especially divided into parties, and the tone and feeling of these have of late years become more intense. We use the word 'parties,' applying it alike to both the great divisions of the English Church; not that we think both alike in point of truth, but because we are going to speak now of a property which belongs to all parties, right and wrong ones, alike. It is the nature of all parties to be adulatory. They praise their prominent and serviceable adherents, without limit or qualification. And they do this upon a principle not unreasonable or unjust. We will illustrate the case by one, not wholly similar, but somewhat analogous. Everybody knows the unqualified tone which prevails at public meetings, especially at public dinners, with regard to individuals. That a man has lived so many years in a town or county respectably, and has been an attentive magistrate, a courteous mayor, an active churchwarden, or a vigilant poor-law guardian, is sufficient to procure him a tribute of commendation which would not have disappointed the appetite of a Roman Emperor or an Eastern Caliph. Every motive which has distinguished heroes, from the earliest dawn of history, is attributed to him in perfect purity. He has been inspired with the love of his fellow-citizens, and been absorbed in their interests. For their sake he has braved the greatest dangers, and surmounted the most overwhelming difficulties. His sacrifices are supposed to be incalculable; but what is that to one to whom private interest has been always an idea unknown? Such is the warm estimate of character which speakers adopt on such occasions, and the benevolence of praise grows with its exertion, and demands fresh and fresh objects. Perfect virtue before long owns for her sons the proprietors of the chief seats in the neighbourhood, and the leading inhabitants of the borough. In due course she has made a considerable inroad on the principal streets. Now a spectator of such a scene, who only looked upon the surface, would beyond a doubt set it down as ridiculous. But—we pardon a mistake which is so easily made—it is not. Let us not treat such a subject superficially. The basis on which these demonstrations take place is this, that that is the *place* for praising people. True, it is said, all these persons may have their faults, and they may be noticed in their proper place: but this is not the *place* for noticing them. We are met *here* to commend one another. That is our object. The theory of such demonstrations thus at once confines them to

Digitized by Google

praise, to the entire omission of whatever may jar with that object. But praise which is without balance is obliged in consistency to be high. Its subject is by the hypothesis faultless, and it must equal its subject.

Now party praise proceeds upon a rationale not unlike this. Just as the public meeting is not the *place* to notice the faults of its principal attendants, so a party, if we may be allowed the expression, is not the *person* to notice errors in its eminent and conspicuous members. There may be two sides in the case, but it is only our function, says the party, to notice one. If there is anything wrong about our friends and supporters, let the opposition find it out, but it is not our especial duty to be calling attention to it. We have the duty of helping and encouraging them; so if they write anything we praise it; if they do anything, it is correct in our eyes. There is some reason in this ground. Parties are collections of persons who agree in certain main objects, which they wish to forward. To forward such objects it is necessary to encourage individual activity and zeal. But encouragement implies a hearty and warm tone in the encouraging tongue and pen. The criticizer is in the position, at the outset, of a friend. He is preengaged on the favourable side, as friends and relations are to one another. It would be out of place for him to be 'damning with faint praise' and studious balance every effort that zeal on his own side made.

But while the ground which a party takes on this subject is not itself unreasonable, it is to be feared it has its disadvantageous effects; and that such a position, however necessary for it, and on the whole working well, is procured at some expense. It is quite true that really sensible minds will understand this position, and will value the praise they get accordingly. They will know that it is praise upon an hypothesis of partiality. They will take such a proper business-like view of it, as results from perceiving the natural laws of party action, and the original exigencies of party which create those laws. But, unfortunately, it is not every clever, or every zealous, or every sincere mind, that is sensible. Moreover, it is not every one who is sensible with regard to others, who is sensible with regard to himself. It is to be feared that unqualified praise does operate disadvantageously upon some, who receive the tribute, and forget the understanding on which it is paid; are satisfied with the effect, and make no curious inquiries into the cause and foundation. There are many excellent persons who are tolerably indifferent as to what is underneath, in such a case, provided there is merit in the superstructure. To such the liberal offerings of party sympathy are somewhat of a snare, too

Digitized by Google

soothing to the spirits, too grateful to the sense; they domesticate certain infirmities of the character, and drag upon the ascent in the path of Christian humility.

We may observe, by the way, that this *rationale* of party praise accounts for a fact which would otherwise be very inexplicable, viz., the coolness with which the desertion of an eminent champion is sometimes taken by the main body. After the favouring voice of several years has given an individual a position, he goes, and the body would seem to be in a great difficulty. But it proceeds almost unconscious of its loss. The reason is, that the great man was its own creation. It made him, by its own act of setting him and keeping him up. The party itself, therefore, is the substance of the man. He cannot deprive it then of his substance, whatever he does, for that does not belong to him; but only of the residuum, which is left over and above the substance, that is to say, his own particular person. There are various degrees of the real and artificial in most reputations, and according as the one ingredient or the other predominates, the loss of the man is felt.

We may consider, then, that we have shown that, upon broad and general grounds, individuals are always amenable to criticism, and that the particular circumstances of our own Church and day, make it expedient to exert, occasionally, this right over them, the tendency of even honest and necessary party action being to over-estimate them and elevate them unduly.

No greater tribute can be paid to the character and services of Miss Sellon, than that we should think this long apology necessary before venturing to make the least independent criticism upon her proceedings. She may be assured that after all we feel ourselves not a little audacious; nevertheless having summoned spirit for the occasion, we shall speak with that freedom which is necessary for proper clearness and serviceableness.

We shall not go into details. The pamphlets before us are full of minute charges, affecting Miss Sellon's prudence, temper, and orthodoxy. She has refuted some of these particulars. We are willing to believe that she might refute more if she thought it requisite; and perhaps we could wish that she did think it requisite, for society has a claim upon her for every explanation which she can afford for its satisfaction.

But amidst much that is trivial and idle, these pamphlets reveal one point about Miss Sellon's institution, which we cannot pass over. The 'Rule of Obedience,' as enforced there, would seem to involve a very large and serious change upon the original purpose of the Sisterhood. We give it as

Digitized by Google

laid down in the rules of the Society—we say *rules*, for though Miss Sellon denies their formal and established character, calling them 'a little sketch, or suggestive sketch of rules, 'which I was asked to write, which has passed from hand to hand, 'first in London and then elsewhere—I do not know who has 'it, I have not a copy;' it appears, at any rate, that they exist in writing, and facts which come out show that she practically adopts them. The rule on the subject of 'holy obedience' runs thus: 'Ye who have offered up to God your judgment 'and your will, must strive to persevere and grow in the submis-'sion ye have professed.' . . . . 'Ye shall ever address the 'spiritual mother with honour and respect; avoid speaking of 'her among yourselves; cherish and obey her with holy love, 'without any murmur or sign of hesitation or repugnance, but 'simply, cordially, and promptly obey with cheerfulness, and 'banish from your mind any question as to the wisdom of the 'command given you. If ye fail in this, ye have failed to resist 'a temptation of the Evil One. Ye shall never discuss with any 'person, (except by express direction of the spiritual mother,) 'either within the Society or without it, the rules of the Order 'or the commands of the Superior . . . and ye shall make it a 'subject of immediate confession to your Superior, if ye have 'unhappily been betrayed into this error; and ye shall receive a 'penance, but no word of admonition or reproof for the same '. . . . ye shall learn, through daily control, observation and 'practice, that through the exercise of lowly and entire obedience 'ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost . . . If any sister 'fail in obedience, or resist with contumacy and rebellion, she 'shall be punished at discretion . . . . Be ye well persuaded, 'that on negligence or exactitude in obedience depends the 'preservation of discipline, the purity of the Society, and the 'progress of each soul in the way of life.'

Now when the Sisterhood at Devonport was first established, it was established upon a very simple and natural basis—a basis, viz., of Christian charity and self-denial, as these virtues are ordinarily understood. There was a large poor population, destitute of spiritual instruction and care, and appealing to the pity of Christian society. To supply this want a Sisterhood was formed, to reside upon the spot, and engage personally in the work of visiting and educating; besides administering the alms entrusted to them. There was nothing in such an institution, either as regarded the labours of the Sisterhood, or the objects to which they were applied, but what harmonized with natural feelings. All men are agreed that it is advantageous that the poor should be visited, the ignorant instructed; and all are agreed that it is a good and charitable thing to visit and

Digitized by Google

instruct. Thus, though the particular form which the institution took was new and not common, the idea of duty to which the institution appealed was a common one, the idea which the Christian world at large has.

But this rule of obedience appeals to a very different standard from the common or recognised one. Here we feel at once that we are leaving the large and open field of Christian morals, and entering a much more confined, esoteric, and conventional one. The duty of obedience, stating it generally, is undoubtedly a natural and common-sense Christian duty, and one of the most important of existing duties. There can be no difference among Christians here. But on examining what the obedience, thus required by common Christian consent and feeling, is, we find that it is in every case limited by some natural consideration of use and purpose. Subjects are bound to obey the laws of the State under which they live; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the welfare of society. Soldiers are bound to obey the commands of the general; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the success of military undertakings. Servants are bound to obey their masters; but it is because such obedience is necessary for the order and management of a household. And generally all persons are bound to submit to those masters and directors to whom either Providence or voluntary engagement has attached them, on those points on which their authority applies; but it is only on those points, and not upon others, that obedience is incumbent on them. Here, then, is a natural limit of use and purpose, up to which obedience is obligatory, and beyond which it is not. The subjects of a State are not under any obligation to agree with or approve of its laws because they are bound to obey them. The same remark applies to the case of soldiers and servants. Even the parental authority, the most searching that nature presents, does not extend to a dominion over mind and conscience.

This, in a word, is the distinction between human authority and Divine. Divine authority extends to the conscience,—human authority only to the acts of men. When it is proved that such and such a command has been given by God, it is the duty of every human being not only to obey it in act, but to conform his own moral sense to it,—to think within himself that to be right and that to be wrong which Revelation announces respectively to be so. But human authority has no claim to the submission of the moral sense, but only of the outward conduct; because every man receives his moral sense immediately from God, and that which comes immediately from God cannot acknowledge any creature as absolute master. It is quite true that obedience, in these human relations, ought to

be as much as possible a cheerful and willing one. A person in a subject position ought always, if he *can*, to think his superior in the right, and ought to start with every bias in his favour. His obedience ought even to extend to the mind and conscience, so far as he ought reasonably to suppose his superior's mind and conscience to be better than his own on the matter in question. But whether he ought to suppose that or not, depends upon various circumstances of knowledge, opportunity, and relative position, and not upon any absolute law. A child ought to think its parent always right, for its intellect and conscience are in a very rudimental state, and therefore ought in all cases—for we will not contemplate at present any exception—to accommodate themselves to those of the parent. But as the child grows up, this duty is modified. A common soldier ought to take it for granted that his general is in the right in commanding any particular line of operation; or rather, he ought to pretend to no judgment at all in the matter. On the other hand, a superior officer, who is equally bound with the common soldier to pay the obedience of act, has much greater liberty of internal judgment,—a liberty which he not only may, but ought to use; otherwise he may be spoiling his own military eye, and depriving his country of future services. Any one who reflects will see that this pliable rule with regard to individual judgment secures all the humility and temper in its exercise which morality requires, providing as it does that every man should give way on those points on which his sense and knowledge are inferior. If people saw their own deficiencies properly, and drew this practical inference from them, nothing more would be wanted, but humility would be at once in operation on the amplest scale.

The duty of obedience, then, as owed from one man to another, is, as understood by the common sense and conscience of mankind, a limited thing. It rests for its foundation on the absolute need of such a rule of action for carrying on the system of things in which we are, and conducting any business whatever in which human interests are concerned, religious, political, or social. And when it has answered these purposes, it ceases to be obligatory and essential. The rule prescribes that everything shall be *done* which competent and authorized persons in the several departments of human life appoint. But, after securing full and proper action, it does not pry into the interior of the man, and command the motions of his mind and moral sense.

Now let us examine the Rule of Holy Obedience as put forth in Miss Sellon's code. No sensible person would grudge the Superior of such an institution as hers the amplest powers which are wanted for its efficient management. No sensible person, therefore, would grudge her very large rights over the obedience

of the inferior sisters. But does the 'Rule of Holy Obedience' limit itself to this practical object, and content itself with this useful jurisdiction? 'Ye shall banish from your mind,' it says, 'any question as to the wisdom of the command given you. If 'ye fail in this, ye have failed to resist a temptation of the Evil 'One. . . . . Ye shall never discuss with any person, either 'within the Society or without, the rules of the Order or the 'commands of the Superior; . . . . and ye shall make it a 'subject of immediate confession to your Superior, if ye have 'unhappily been betrayed into this error; and ye shall receive 'a penance, but no word of admonition or reproof for the same.' No sister, then, must ever express any opinion as to the Superior's acts and proceedings; and no sister must even entertain and harbour any opinion, if it is unfavourable. The rule stretches the duty of obedience beyond the sphere of action into that of word, and even into that of inward and secret thought. Now, the prohibition of outward expression of opinion, had the rule been limited to that, might perhaps have been defended on a practical ground; for it might be said that such expression tends to spread dissatisfaction among the members of a society, and so to enfeeble even necessary external obedience. To carry such a consideration as this, indeed, so far as to forbid absolutely all expression of opinion whatever, would appear to us a great overstretching of it; and a rule which took a middle line, and forbad formal, vehement, or promiscuous discussion, while it left a sister at liberty to make privately to another, as conversation might lead her, any remark that might occur to her on the Superior's proceedings, would not seem more than a due concession to the natural wants and claims of the human mind. Religious and educated ladies might be trusted to draw the distinction between a word of comment and an act of insubordination. An unqualified rule against 'discussion,' if by discussion is meant any intercourse of opinion whatever, does appear to us a gratuitous burden. Still there is some room for a practical ground of defence with regard to it. But how can it be said that it is necessary for the management of the institution, that no sister should *think*, with respect to any proceeding, differently from the Superior? Yet this is what the Rule says:—'Ye shall '*banish from your mind* any question as to the wisdom of the 'command given you.' That is to say, the mind is to banish its own idea, and receive that of the Superior, in every instance in which there is any difference between the two. The very inner sense and judgment must be reduced to an agreement with those of another person. There can hardly be a pretence, to say that an institution which has the simple practical object of visiting the poor, teaching children in schools, and distributing

Digitized by Google

food and clothing in a destitute district, can positively not be carried on without this most extraordinary transmutation of one person's mind into another's. Cannot any person of ordinary capacity and good feeling be made to perceive that his judgment may differ from a superior's, but that he must do what the superior tells him? Is not this the commonest and most acknowledged distinction which society holds? But if it is a plain distinction at all, it excludes the necessity of any such obedience as Miss Sellon's rule describes, so far as the legitimate objects of her institution are concerned.

Here then we see insisted on an obedience which is not the plain and commonly understood duty, but a peculiar and esoteric one; an obedience which is released from the tie of a practical end and purpose. It may be thought by some that the duty gains in dignity and depth by such a release. We do not think so. It becomes unmeasured indeed, and expands indefinitely, when released from this tie: but measure is no degradation, if there is a good and sufficient reason for it, if it is the nature of the duty to be measured; while, on the other hand, the separation of a duty from the great objects and uses for which it exists, makes it insipid and meaningless. Removed from a solid basis, it hangs suspended in the air, an idle absurd thing, without place in nature. Utility is that which really ennobles it; that which makes the rational being not ashamed, but proud, of being obedient. Man works, and is proud of working, because the divine decree has gone forth which makes labour necessary for the welfare of mankind. So he obeys, and is proud of obeying, because obedience is necessary for the same end. He knows there must be order, system, subordination; otherwise no work under the heavens can go on, and the world must come to a stand-still. He consents then with satisfaction to making himself so useful, so serviceable: he is, though but one, yet one of the countless props on which the world, under Providence, rests. But to an obedience independent of object and use, to an individual as such, where is the call? A man meets you in the streets, and says, Obey me,—you will find obedience salutary; it is good to abandon your own will. What do you say to such a request? you say naturally, Obedience is good, but why should I obey *you?* why should I accommodate my mind to yours, any more than you yours to mine? It is thus that the severed and isolated duty is cast off, like dross from the great system of human life; no pathway of reason conducts to it. How can I be satisfied with obeying you, because you are yourself in the year 1852? What jurisdiction does that circumstance create? And just as obedience to an individual as such is absurd, so obedience to an individual who possesses over you legitimate

Digitized by Google

authority for a practical object, is absurd so far as it is claimed beyond that object. Miss Sellon differs from a man who meets you in the streets in this,—that she starts with a real claim. But so far as she exceeds that claim, so far she is exactly in the position of the man who meets you in the streets. The Superior of the sisterhood at Davenport can only claim obedience so far as concerns the welfare of her institution; if she claims any more than this, she claims it as Miss Sellon. But why should Miss Sellon be obeyed, more than any other intelligent and religious young lady in Her Majesty's dominions?

We cannot, indeed, but pause an instant to observe what appears to us an inconvenient consequence of such a rule. If obedience performs so absorbing a part in the formation of the Christian character in a sisterhood, it seems a pity that the Superior should be deprived of so essential an advantage. Who has so much claim to the beneficial influence of the institution as a school of spiritual education, as she who contributes most to it, the head herself? But upon this rule she is excluded from the benefit. Obedience indeed pervades the establishment from one end to the other, but most unfortunately she receives it, and does not pay it. She is condemned to the unprofitable side of the action, while all the rest are flourishing upon the fertility and the fatness of the side opposite; she famishes in the midst of plenty, and is mocked by a luxuriance all around her, which she cannot touch. We could indeed admire the generosity of the sacrifice, but justice is too alive to its severity. It is too romantic, too sharp a self-denial to order, under such circumstances, instead of obey, control instead of submit, dictate to others instead of being dictated to, and insist on your neighbour succumbing to your mould, instead of claiming your right of admission to his. Not that Miss Sellon is not equal even to such a trial, but it should not be required of her. For it must be remembered that the exchange is not simply of a privileged state for one without such privilege, but of a privileged state for one that has directly the contrary properties. For there is no argument upon which obedience is proved to be salutary, by which a situation of command is not at the same time proved to be dangerous. Were the obedience we speak of indeed only one ingredient among others in the formation of a spiritual character, its loss might be supplied by some other trial; though in that case there would be no necessity to make this duty so dominant and absorbing. But if it is endowed with these exclusive powers, and made the one channel to perfection, then its loss must be irremediable.

The remark then that we made to begin with, that whereas Miss Sellon's institution, at its first establishment, appealed to

Digitized by Google

the large and commonly recognised standard of Christian duty, it has now formed an alliance with another and conventional standard, has, we fear, been verified. We cannot but regard this 'rule of holy obedience,' as a foreign element introduced into the ethics of the institution, gratuitous, esoteric, and artificial; and consider that so far as the institution has adopted it, so far it has diverged from its original purpose. Nobody wanted Miss Sellon to become the head of a new school of spiritual education, and embody a new theory of Christian ethics. She was wanted for the practical purpose of teaching, visiting, and administering charity in a destitute population, and for the superintendence of the labours of others like herself for that purpose. It was thought that the members of the sisterhood were under her for that purpose, and not for the purpose of being themselves operated on, and used as the material for exemplifying an idea. They were considered her coadjutors, not her subject matter. And doubtless they are her coadjutors now; but it is difficult not to see that the other aspect of them is at least as favourite a one in the mind of their Superior.

We may add to the unsoundness of such a standard of obedience in itself, some bad effects which will follow from it, affecting the institution itself and the cause of such institutions in general. While Miss Sellon has gathered around her, and will gather, some earnest and valuable minds, who happen to be cast in a mould congenial to such a yoke, she will exclude many others of a stronger and firmer mould, who cannot and ought not to submit to it. She has narrowed her ground. Nor can we forget the fact, however particular circumstances may modify our inference from it, that already, in two different instances, sisters have left her establishment, scandalized at it, and declaring themselves unable to bear its peculiar rules longer. These facts, after giving all due weight to the explanation which has been given of them, leave on an impartial mind the impression that the bow has been bent too tight. Moreover, the cause of sisterhoods in general has suffered from this new development of this one; for the impression has been left upon the public mind, that such institutions are necessarily connected with an artificial religious standard, and that they do not rest upon any large ground of Christian principle.

And as we cannot approve of this change itself, so neither can we approve of the mode in which this and other changes were introduced, and cannot but consider that some grave claims were unattended to in the process.

The institution at Devonport commenced with a body of rules. There was a rule, for example, to guard the liberty of the sisters, giving 'free liberty to any sister to withdraw, if it shall

Digitized by Google

so seem good to her.' There was a rule to guard the property of the sisters: 'that any sister so withdrawing, or in any way ceasing to be a member of the Society, shall be entitled to her own personal property.'

But the Institution at Devonport had not only rules, but a Visitor. The Bishop of the diocese consented, at the request of the Superior, to undertake that office. It was thus a complete institution in its formation; with a set of rules, and an official interpreter of those rules, in case any question or doubt arose.

Under these circumstances one step would seem to have been right and necessary before introducing any changes in the basis of the institution, or departing from the natural construction of the existing rules. The Superior had no right to do this without first consulting the Visitor. But this, we regret to say, Miss Sellon did, and that largely. We refer to the letter of the Visitor himself on the subject:—

'I frankly avow that I do not think those rules form any longer a true criterion of the nature of your institution. Let me cite the two first of them:—

'"I. A legal instrument has been prepared, by which certain of the sisters have agreed to live together (conforming to certain regulations sanctioned by the Bishop, for the better conduct of the interior of the institution), but *with free liberty to any sister to withdraw, if it shall so seem good to her.*"

'This was the prime, the fundamental principle on which I consented to be your Visitor. That it has been knowingly and intentionally departed from I am very far from saying. You are incapable of knowingly departing from any condition under which you have ever placed yourself; yet that it has been *virtually* abandoned, is, in my judgment, manifest, not merely from the portion of your letter to Miss ——, cited in the pamphlet of Mr. Spurrell, p. 39, but also from your own comment in your "Reply," p. 9, and still more from your observations, in p. 21, on "the sacred calling," "the calling of God" to your sisterhood, and the sinfulness of "looking back" in any who "had perceived this calling, and who having, after due trial, given herself to it, had yet retracted."

'I avoid entering into consideration of the sacredness of such a calling, still more into the question whether it be of such a kind that to relinquish it is indeed, as you scruple not to declare, "yielding to temptation, as did Demas," who, be it remembered, forsook an apostle, and with him the service of his divine Lord, "loving this world rather than to suffer hardships." I enter not into this consideration, I say, because it is enough for my present purpose to show the virtual inconsistency of such a calling with the first fundamental rule of your institution, that there be "free liberty to every sister to withdraw, if it shall so seem good to her."

'Now let me not be misunderstood. I am very far from blaming you and the sisters at aiming at what is impossible, when you and they have listened to "that voice in the heart which bids it think no longer of earth, which calls the soul to live only for the Lord, in bringing other souls to Him." I only mean that this is a course of life beyond and above that which was contemplated when I accepted the office of your Visitor.

'II. Again, with regard to your second rule:—"That any sister so withdrawing, or in any way ceasing to be a member of the Society, shall be entitled to her own personal property; but neither she nor her heirs shall be entitled to any share of the common property of the Society."

'Now, how does the course actually followed by you accord with this? The rule implies that the property which every sister may bring with her shall continue to be hers, at her sole disposal; and that when by death she ceases to be a sister, she may bequeath her property to whomsoever she may think fit. This was a matter particularly contemplated when those rules received my sanction; for I apprehended that, without some such provision, great abuses might occur, and still greater be suspected; and yet I read, in p. 22 of your "Reply," "We have all things in common. When we receive money of our own, we put it into the treasurer's hands, and it goes to the common stock, unless any sister thinks it *her duty to send it* out of the community *as soon as* she receives it." What then becomes of her personal property in anything which she does not think it her duty to send away as soon as she receives it? It should seem that nothing but a sense of "duty" would justify a sister in employing any part of her own funds, in any manner, or for any purpose, except the increase of the common stock of the community. Inclination, affection, preference on any account, except "duty," is not to be permitted to influence a sister in disposing of her property, even "as soon as she receives it." Nor, if she then omit to attend to what may be deemed the demands of "duty," is she at liberty afterwards to regard the property as her own: it will have been merged in the common fund.

'Again, if she use the liberty reserved to her by the first rule—"to withdraw, if it shall so seem good to her"—it should seem that there will be no "personal property of her own" to which she will be "entitled." All will have passed to the community; and if she withdraw, she must be content to withdraw penniless, or with only that which the sisters may think fit to give to her.'—*Bp. of Exeter's Letter, &c.* pp. 3—6.

We are obliged, then, to observe that Miss Sellon departed largely from the natural construction of the rules of the sisterhood, and introduced important changes upon her own idea, without once consulting the official authority appointed for such questions. And we cannot but remark on the occasion, how easily too high an estimate of a particular duty combines, in the very same minds, with a much too low one, according as circumstances affect them. There was no engagement of obedience which Miss Sellon's coadjutors had made to her, which Miss Sellon herself had not made to her Visitor, quite as strongly and definitely, with respect to the points to which his authority applied. Yet while she enlarges the standard of obedience in the case of the sisters, till it absorbs their whole reason and judgment, she diminishes it as from herself to the Visitor, until it becomes no obedience at all. She can see the duty much too readily when it comes in the shape of a mysterious and unlimited prostration; she cannot see it at all when it comes in the shape of a plain and positive engagement. And we are compelled also to make another remark, which we do with much pain and reluctance; and that is, that persons are too apt to see the duty of obedience with different eyes, according as they owe it to others, or as others owe it to them.

We have given our judgment, formed with all the consideration we have been able to bestow, on the main features of Miss Sellon's proceedings, and the principles she has adopted for the

management of her sisterhood. And now the reader may ask, what practical conclusion is to be drawn? Are those who have hitherto supported the institution to continue to support it, or not?—those, we mean, who have supported it hitherto upon the understanding that the principles upon which it was managed were such as the ordinary Churchman acknowledges, but who now discover that that standard has been departed from.

Now, with regard to this question, we must at the outset admit, that the institution does in one respect stand on a different ground from that on which it stood before the recent events, and that that difference of ground does affect the appeal to the members of our Church, as far as it goes. As an institution proceeding upon a set of rules, of which a Bishop of the Church was the official interpreter and guardian, it gave a pledge to members of the Church that it would adhere to a certain standard. That pledge it does not now give. It has no longer an official connexion, and stands on an independent ground. Moreover, it has actually diverged from the recognised standard. But these admissions made, leave, we think, still a large and ample ground on which the institution may appeal to public support. On the practical question of support, it is not whether *any* divergence at all from an approved standard, but *how much*, has taken place, that is to be decided.

We could wish this distinction were more commonly attended to than it is. It is, indeed, a most important one, one essential to every mind that is bent upon acting fairly by all persons and all objects and causes that it has to deal with. And yet how much it is lost sight of; how do multitudes of men, as a matter of course, upon the first sight of any one exceptionable element in an undertaking, however many others there may be good, start back; the immediate impulse being that they will have nothing to do with it. How do others, who have sufficient good sense to distinguish between what is obviously trivial and what is of importance, yet suppose, as a matter of course, that *any* importance whatever is enough to make a ground of separation. In matters social or political the unreasonableness of such a rule is soon seen, and men agree to differ even on points of acknowledged importance, to forward some common object. But in religion it is otherwise; any importance at all is immediately considered to be fundamental.

The rule which general sense and fairness seem to establish in cases of individual exertion, where it serves important objects, and is made at great cost and sacrifice to the person, is this; that in proportion to the sacrifice he makes and the talents he contributes to an undertaking, he ought to be allowed to have his own way in the management of it. We say this, leaving to be understood the proper exceptions to such a rule, and proper

Digitized by Google

limitations of its meaning. No amount of sacrifice or ability on the part of an individual in conducting an undertaking, is any reason why we should allow anything which we think essentially wrong. Again, no amount of sacrifice or ability give him the right to demand our *approval* even of what we allow. But reserving our approval, and excepting essential points, a large field is still left of allowance in things not essential. Let us not grudge him his own way to a large amount within these limits. If he has any peculiarities, let him indulge them; if he has favourite ideas, let him bring them out. Expect him to give the undertaking the mould, in some measure, of his own mind. If he is not allowed a fair amount of his own way, the result is, that he throws up the matter altogether, and that society is deprived of his services. The very charm, to a large extent, of the work to him,—that which keeps him close to it and enables him to undergo so much toil in the prosecution of it,—is the employment it affords to his own individual biasses, tastes, and ideas. He likes to feel the individual element within him energizing; that he himself—as distinguished from all other mortals that ever have been, are, or will be—is doing something. He enjoys the sensation of a productive, as distinguished from an inert individuality, one which impresses itself on the world without, and makes some portion at least of nature—*rerum natura*—however limited, obedient to it.

When, three or four years ago, a large, enthusiastic, and then unsuppressed party in France were agitating for the regeneration of the social system upon principles of pure equality and benevolence; when the Socialists were contending for a new commercial basis, viz. that all should contribute labour and skill to one large object, the good of the community; the individual being content to receive as the reward of his exertions, however great, his own share, however small, of the general product, they were met in the National Assembly by an argument. The man of the most acute practical intellect in that assembly, and its ablest and most commanding speaker, who did not disdain, moreover, on the occasion, to borrow from the pages of a writer even more philosophic and acute than himself,—M. Thiers, repeating Hume, said this simply—(if we give the kernel of the argument it will be enough.) He said—If you want to have certain effects produced in the world, you must have a *motive* which is *strong* enough to produce them. Society wants to have produced for it, the effects—trade, manufacture, art, skill, labour, capital—the whole commercial system. The only motive which is strong enough to produce these effects, is the motive of private interest. Give the individual a private interest in the result of his labours, allow him to look forward to the possession of an estate, the founding of a family, and he will work as hard as you like.

Digitized by Google

And the result will extend from himself to society at large. The public will ultimately profit by that which private interest set going. Discoveries will be made, skill improved, system extended, and a whole commercial world arise upon this principle. But this is the only principle which is strong enough to produce these effects. Introduce in its stead a general benevolence, and the whole fabric will fall from simple want of support. The latter is too weak a motive to work upon.

The great ancient moral philosopher applied the same principle to a much more delicate and sensitive subject. We have not his great work by our side at present, and must use the recollections of many years ago, under the correction, if they or their application be erroneous, of the friendly reader who knows better. Aristotle treats the subject of morals in an order, as it may be called, first abstract and next concrete. First the important questions are settled, that virtue is necessary for happiness, and that such and such habits are virtues. An elaborate catalogue of these noble habits is given, and each is described with great accuracy and completeness. But at this stage of the treatise,—that is to say, every part of an exalted moral character having been successfully drawn,—the mind of the great pagan appears to be impressed with some apprehension respecting its embodiment. He appears to see some great difficulties in the way of the actual man exhibiting these perfections, at any rate on a triumphant scale. And yet his philosophy would demand that there should be such persons in the world, and that they should be more than one or two: for his idea of existence was confined to this world, and therefore he would naturally expect that this world should be able to produce in a good and sufficient number of instances, the perfect character; otherwise, we have ideas which are not realized effectually, and nature is guilty of a fiction. In this difficulty he has recourse to the same eminently serviceable principle to which Hume and M. Thiers appeal. The virtues of the good man, are allowed to grow up περὶ αὐτὸν,—'about himself.' The permission is a significant one, too significant. However, once given, the convenience of it is felt. Virtue becomes a more practicable thing, the path to perfection much more commodious. The 'good man' is made the member of a state, a leading member. In this capacity he does noble services to his country, fellow-citizens, and friends: he exhibits, in doing them, wisdom, magnanimity, benevolence, courage, &c. But all this moral formation goes on περὶ αὐτὸν, 'about himself;' his position is greatly improved by means of it, and virtue is the highest, the purest, and the noblest engine, but still the engine of promotion. Under such fostering influences, she has a splendid growth; she makes powerful strides in the individual, the whole community

outside looking on; till at last, commanding universal respect, he grows into a model, and the highest combination of position, reputation, and ethics stands before us. The character is not unlike that of the modern statesman of the higher class: one who is attentive to the improvement of public morals, and adopts a conscientious and honourable standard of public service. Such a man exhibits high public virtues, and a moral formation may be said to go on in his case, *περὶ αὐτὸν*, about self. The stimulus of an honourable ambition, the idea of the career which he has to fulfil, sustains his ethical aims, tastes, and labours.

It is thus that Aristotle produces an embodiment of the virtues. He saw that a strong motive was wanted to put in effective action the moral powers of man, and he supplies one. The motive is one indeed which has a more suitable application in the commercial world than in the moral, and produces the physical good of the community more faithfully than the virtue of the individual. But either application will do for the purpose of illustration.

That which the motive of private interest, then, effects in the material system of society, religious bias and peculiarity effect in the world of religion. There is a department of large and general religious truth which all in the same Church acknowledge; and there is a department of peculiar and controversial truth, which some think to be truth, and others not. The tendency of human nature is to take much more interest in the latter than in the former department of truth. Large and general truth has no charm for many minds. But set them upon some idea which they are conscious is rather peculiar to themselves, and which appeals to the resources of their own private and particular treasury of thought, and they are all alive: they want to communicate it to others; they become teachers. If they are preachers, they will begin sometimes with common and acknowledged truths, but the discourse soon falls into the private channel. This is the stimulus which makes them interested, zealous, and active, about religious truth at all. If they are practical workers in the Church, they try to impress the peculiar, the favourite sentiment upon their work. That is their stimulus to production. Do not most of us know men with whom the alternative would simply be between a working peculiarity and a total inertness, who if they were not arbitrary would be weak, and who make a bargain with religion at the outset, to colour her, or take no trouble about her? And yet the services of such minds are not to be lost to religion. It is better that they should teach a coloured truth, provided no vital part is affected, rather than not teach at all; and that they should do a mixed work rather than none. Indeed, we are here con-

Digitized by Google

cerned with a mysterious question relating to the human mind, which we shall not try to solve. For in the present narrow condition of our faculties, cannot we conceive it to be a sort of impossibility with many that they should embrace truth, other than in this way; inasmuch as if they admit it into their minds at all, it cannot be by any other opening than such as their minds have? May not the very instrument for attaining all the compass of thought possible for them, be this very individuality, which operates as a quickening principle, sharpening the sense while it confines it, and causing whatever appreciation even of truth, general and large, such minds can attain to?

If this is the case, then, it is to the advantage of the Church that it should acknowledge and avail itself of this principle, allowing for the bad results which may follow, together with the good ones, in its working. The work of religion in the world is conducted by individuals; the consequence is a mixture. But those who know the laws upon which the human mind acts, will expect no less. And they will expect it most in the case of those very persons who are most anxious to do good, for in the zealous and the energetic the individual element is most strong. Undertakings large and important for the benefit of society are not begun without some great impulse; but a strong impulse is more difficult to regulate than a weak one, and must often go further than the mark. The rule, then, that we laid down applies: if those who have all the trouble and pains of sustaining an undertaking do impart to it some peculiarity from their own minds, let us not be surprised, or complain too bitterly. Go through the wide world, and you will see pervading every department a rule—the rule of *quid pro quo*. Search east and west, north and south, look high and look low; in society, trade, politics, it is the same law, and you cannot escape it. Those who give will take, those who expend their own strength will indulge their own bias, and those who do the work will claim their own way of doing it. Do not demand, then, that a work shall comply with your own standard before you support it. You will never see such a work, and will have to wait till doomsday. There will be always something to object to, some divergence from your own idea. Some persons do, indeed, go on to the last day of their lives, wondering why others do not see as they do; the fact never ceases to surprise them, and after the experience of the whole day long retains the first freshness of the early dawn. They go on to the last, having their model, to which everything whatever done must come up, at the cost of absolute offence, if it does not. But of such it is only necessary to say, that it is marvellous how they do not see those laws of human action which obtrude themselves upon their observation every day. There is certainly a primary difference between

minds, that some do, and others do not, see the world which they are in.

The question then is, whether Miss Sellon's institution has diverged from the standard, which the body of our Church people recognise, *more* than is fairly tolerable, and may be allowed, though not approved? And to that we answer decidedly, No! We regret, and have given our reasons why, the turn which she has of late given to her institution, her extravagant demand upon the obedience of her sisterhood, and other changes. Such a demand is itself improper, and cannot work well either for her own sisterhood, or the cause of sisterhoods generally. Still we see nothing in it but what comes within the pale of Christian liberty. If any society of young ladies choose voluntarily to put themselves under Miss Sellon's guidance, and accept her judgment on all points, so long as she does not tell them to do what is wrong, we do not see why they should be interfered with. They have a right to do what they will with their own, and if they deliver up their own judgment to another, it is yet their own judgment, and not any body's else, that they give up. And if such submission leads them to spend their lives in visiting the poor, and instructing children in schools, it is not a result which either the Church or the community can complain of.

It has been the fault of the English Church that it has been over jealous of its own standard, and looked with too much suspicion on zeal and energy wherever they have at all deviated from it. This is an old topic. There is the case of Wesley and the Methodists in the last century. This jealousy does, indeed, lie very deep in the main body of our people. They will allow no interval between the substantial squire's, the reputable tradesman's model, and fatuity. And yet there is a cry on all sides for workers. We hear how much is wanted to be done, how the people are perishing for want of knowledge, and vice reigning in our crowded cities. But the worker comes, and because he does not do his work exactly in the way we want, he is dismissed. But if we wait for the convenient and accommodating workman, who will take all the trouble and have none of the choice, we shall wait long enough. Here is a case in point —the very case before us. Here is an institution which has been at work about three years, and in that short time it has managed to diverge considerably from the original idea on which it was raised. Shall we suppress this institution then that diverges, and have another which does not? So be it; and let us suppose another institution raised: and in three more years it will diverge like its predecessor. We do not say this always must be the case; but in a greater or less degree it is to be expected. And so we shall go on for ever inviting labour and dismissing it,

raising fabrics and destroying them. The correct, the model institution, which is to work faultlessly, will never come. How idle is such a course; how unworthy of serious minds, who want good to be done, know there must be workmen to do it, and know the laws of work! See the necessities of the case then, and submit to them. Keep your workman, with his peculiarities, and use his large zeal, his unwearied activity, his noble devotion and self-denial. In a word, be liberal. Let the Church of England be a Church, and not a sect; an empire, not a club. It is the characteristic of empire to be omnigenous; to include as many forms and species, as many laws, customs, nations, and languages, as possible. An empire cannot be stiff; it is contrary to the law of its existence to be so. Until our people learn this liberality and largeness of heart, until the despotism of one model is put down, the Church cannot make use of her resources, but there will be a perpetual waste going on. It is a thing never to be lost sight of, that the despotism of this model ought one day to be deposed. Let no opportunity be lost of showing people how much they lose by their mistake. Let them be at any rate told that it is a mistake. It is something for them to hear such a thing said. Repetition impresses the imagination even where the reason is preoccupied, and a process which has domesticated countless absurdities may promote, perhaps, one truth. Such resistance may be thought the height of absurdity, but the fact is, at any rate, seen that it is made. The Church of England never has yet learned, indeed, this lesson of true liberality, but there is no reason why she should not. There is no impossibility in the case—none, at any rate, of which we are informed, from natural sources.

We have endeavoured to exhibit in this article the combination of a right with a duty, or rather of one duty with another; and we will repeat it at the close, as our advice to any person who may think us in the position to give advice, with respect to the proper posture of mind to assume towards the case of Miss Sellon, and all other such cases. First, use your judgment independently on the right and wrong of any proceedings which come before you, be the agents who they may. Whether particular defects of knowledge or understanding may make you an exception to it, you must of course decide; but this is the general rule. Secondly, when you have made your judgment on the act, do not let it separate you from the agent, or his work and object as a whole. Exercise the strength of your judgment, control its pedantry and arbitrariness. Be independent in opinion, social in action. Give your support to undertakings which on the whole do good, and do not think too much of a few irregularities or obliquities attaching to them.

Digitized by Google

ART. VI.—*Les Provinciales; et leur Réfutation. Par M. l'Abbé* MAYNARD, *Chanoine Honoraire de Poitiers. Ouvrage dédié à Mons. de Vesins, Evêque d'Agen.* Paris: 1851. 2 vols. 8vo.

THIS is a curious book. Pascal's famous Letters elicited, at the time of their publication, a vigorous defence on the part of the great order whom they had attacked so unceremoniously; but of that fierce and eventful controversy they are now almost the sole memorials. It may be supposed that the able and shrewd men against whom they were directed, had something to say to them. As a company, the Jesuits possessed more available talent, more concentrated resources, more discipline, than any public body in Europe. They sifted and contradicted the 'Provincial Letters;' they explained with ingenuity, and even with wit. They made out, with much plausibility, that they had said nothing but what other people had said. But it is very hard now to get a sight of their books. We may look in vain in some of our most famous libraries: they seem all to have disappeared—the Jesuit books which Pascal attacked, and the Jesuit books which attacked Pascal; the Pères Bauny, and Binet, and Garasse, and Le Moyne, his victims, and their defenders, Pères Annat and Nouet, and Pirot and Pinthereau, and even the polite P. Daniel. This want, however, has been supplied by the work before us, an edition of the 'Provincial Letters,' with their refutation by the Abbé Maynard, a French ecclesiastic of some literary pretensions, who may stand very well for the Baunys and Daniels, now so seldom met with.

In noticing this book, we wish one thing distinctly to be understood. It is not that we are opening afresh these bygone scandals. It is M. Maynard who has brought them before us, to show us how he could dispose of them, by an elaborate and ostentatious refutation. And what we propose to consider, is not so much Pascal and his charges, as the way in which M. Maynard deals with them, and the light which his statements, whether in attack or defence, throw on the practical system and feelings of those in whose behalf he speaks. We notice the book the more, because it is a characteristic specimen of the style and spirit which mark the school of Joseph de Maistre—of the line of argument which they adopt—of the self-complacent contempt of facts, the extravagance of misrepresentation and even calumny, which seem to sit so lightly on the consciences, and are expressed so glibly by the pens, of the disciples of that

Digitized by Google

master of brilliant and insolent theory, who bids fair to become the acknowledged exponent of the principles of modern Romanism.

The book is what we might call in England a 'Family *Pascal*.' Pascal's 'Provincial Letters,' says the Abbé Maynard, have done more harm to the cause of religion and the Church in France, than perhaps any other book in the French language. They are the most hypocritical and lying production of the most hypocritical sect of heretics, that ever assailed Christianity. Yet they are so clever, that it is hopeless to expect that Frenchmen will ever cease to read them; and equally hopeless, that they will read the solid refutations which the Jesuits wrote of them. The effect of answers, he says, has only been like that of Père Daniel's book on James the Second's courtiers at S. Germains, who were so delighted with the extracts that he gave from Pascal, in order to refute them, that they sent off at once to Paris for a copy of the *Provinciales*, and thought no more of Père Daniel. What is to be done in this case? says M. Maynard. Doubtless, the best would be, that the *Provinciales* should be forgotten, at any sacrifice to literature. But as this is past praying for, M. Maynard has taken the next best course. He has published, '*on the favourable opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority existing in France*,' a new edition of the *Provinciales*, with all the attractions of Firmin Didot's elegant typography, and a collated text, accompanied with a running and popular refutation in the introductions and notes. The method is convenient, but it has its disadvantages. There is something ungracious in editing a great writer, avowedly to pick him to pieces. But in Pascal's case, it is also rather a perilous method; for we are apt to compare the note-maker with his victim; and a hostile editor of Pascal had need be a considerable person, to venture to place his remarks in proximity with their text, without running the risk of looking very like a lacquey, soliciting our attention to the faults of his master.

The Abbé Maynard, however, fully sensible, as he professes to be, of Pascal's genius, cannot be said to have any fear of this contrast. We might have expected that M. Maynard would have confined himself to careful rectifications of quotations or facts, and to comprehensive expositions of principles or systems. But the lively Abbé is not satisfied with the resources of theology and history. He adds to them the perilous ones of pleasantry. Over and above his heavier artillery, a running fire of sharp little sayings at the bottom of the page, makes answer to the rapid and deadly hits which succeed one another in the text. Besides carefully recording his opinion of the probability of everything that the Jesuits said or insinuated

against Pascal and his friends, as that Jansenius swindled for the benefit of his friend's nephew,[1] M. Maynard has enriched his edition, and thought to damage Pascal, by a vast quantity of brief notes, such as impatient readers scribble with pencil on the margin of irritating books—such, as we are sorry to find, have considerably damaged our own copy of his elegantly printed volumes. They are very commonly in the second person — direct addresses to the offending writer, or his Jesuit interlocutor. Now it is a brisk dialogue in which he pushes Pascal to the wall; now indignant interpellations, such as we used to see reported in the French Chamber; now ironical answers to Pascal's ironical questions; now apostrophes by single words, brief and emphatic:—'*Mensonge!*' '*Calomnie!*'—'*Pourquoi falsifier toujours?*' —'*Non, non! c'est pas vrai!*'—'*Courage, bon père,* (to the Jesuit speaker,) '*vous avez droit dans le fonds, quoique Pascal* '*vous donne tort dans la forme.*'—'*Voilà ce qui est plaisant!*'— '*Mon Dieu! quel entêtement!*'—'*C'est le comble de l'impudence!*' '*C'est une infamie!*'—'*Eh, misérables Gallicans, soyez donc* '*conséquents avec vous-mêmes.*' '*Allons! voilà Gros-Jean qui en* '*remontre à son curé, quelques docteurs pédants qui font la leçon* '*aux Papes!*' Pascal observes that the Jesuits called him '*impie, bouffon, ignorant, farceur, imposteur, calomniateur, fourbe,* '*hérétique Calviniste déguisé, disciple de Du Moulin, possédé d'une* '*légion de diables,* et tout ce qui vous plaît:' the measured annotation says, '*Il y avait bien un peu de tout cela dans l'auteur des* '*Lettres, moins peut-être la légion de diables.*' These sarcastic interjections are varied by others of candour or compassion. At the end of some merciless paragraph of Pascal's, we find his editor only laughing at the joke, '*Nous rions de tout notre cœur;*' or we have little bursts of '*Charmant!*'—'*Charmante satire du pédantisme de l'école!*' showing that he can appreciate the beauty which he deems so fatal. At the end of the ninth *Provinciale,* about the devotional novelties of Pères Bauny and Binet, Pascal adds a postscript to tell his correspondent that since he had written the letter, he had himself seen the books —'ce sont des pièces dignes d'être vues.' We used to think that this was part of the joke. But we were, it seems, mistaken. M. Maynard is both indignant and grieved:—'*Quoi!* '*vous avez écrit une lettre sur des ouvrages que vous ne connaissiez* '*pas, et que vous n'avez lus qu'ensuite! L'aveu est naïf, et se* '*conçoit difficilement d'un homme ordinairement si habile; "men-* '*tita est iniquitas sibi."—Preuve nouvelle,*' he adds, with a sympathetic allowance for genius, '*que le pauvre Pascal était* '*victime de ses amis, acceptait aveuglement leurs mémoires, et se*

[1] Vol. ii. p. 233.

Digitized by Google

'*faisait l'écho docile de leurs erreurs et de leurs passions.*'—Vol. i. p. 441.

These little explosive protests, in which he bandies irony with Pascal, are a curious method of turning the edge of the 'Provincial Letters.' His way of meeting their direct charges is equally remarkable.

Pascal's book, it appears, must be dealt with in a sweeping manner. The safe, and we should imagine, the old answer would be, that the Jesuits were not the Church; and that the relaxed and extravagant opinions which he attacked, were those of individuals, or, at worst, of an order, for which the Church was not responsible. It might be further observed, that lists of propositions, many of them the very ones which Pascal had quoted, were formally condemned shortly after by the Popes; and finally that the Church at length disclaimed the general policy of the Jesuits, showed that even their zeal and services could not excuse their errors, and publicly separated her cause from theirs, by formally dissolving the order. This is one line of defence. There are others also; as that Pascal hit a weak point, but exaggerated it; that he and his friends went as dangerously in one direction as the Jesuits did in the other; that it was really a dispute about speculative and open points, in which both parties lost their temper and their way. But these answers are too tame, have not enough of 'principle' in them, for the dashing philosophy of the disciple of De Maistre.

The Abbé Maynard is one of those eager combatants who disdain to do things by halves. The battle seems to him not worth gaining, unless he can gain one of those heroic ones in which every man of the enemy is killed on the spot, and not one of his own. He accepts the whole weight of the Jesuit case. One side was right without any wrong, and that was the Jesuits; the other wrong without any right, and that was the Jansenists. This is the simple issue, according to M. Maynard, of the quarrel which distracted the great Church of France, in its palmiest days, for a century and a half.

At the same time, M. Maynard is far from giving up the charge against Pascal of gross falsehood and wilful misrepresentation in nearly every text that he cites. But the substance of the refutation is that in all the points which Pascal singled out for attack, whether doctrine, or morality, or discipline, he attacked in the Jesuits what is now universally accepted by the Church. The Abbé's ambition aims at a triumph short of nothing less than the brilliant one of putting Pascal out of court for ever, as being, after every allowance made for genius and bad company, a convicted and notorious liar, hypocrite, impostor, slanderer, and heretic.

Digitized by Google

After M. Maynard's book, it is to be supposed that no one can any longer entertain a doubt on the subject. He, and—if it will take his advice—the rest of the world, will leave Pascal in peace, and his Letters also. The following peroration shows how M. Maynard considers that he has accomplished his task, and is suggestive of the spirit in which he has worked:—

'We are at the end of this long controversy; what is there wanting to complete what we have said in the course of the discussion? For the first time for two centuries, all the documents relating to the cause have been submitted at once to the examination of the public. Well: without any presumption, it seems to us, that no man of fairness will hesitate to pronounce, that the Provincial Letters are the most notoriously calumnious charge ever framed by passion and hatred. As to Pascal himself, divided between our profound sympathy for his person, and our still greater love of Catholic truth, we feel, when we wish to judge him, that our thoughts become confused, and that our words die away on our lips. At the risk of scandalising many men of our days, we will say, nevertheless, that we would gladly tear a page out of his life, even if the provincial letters must go with it. But,—severe for a doctrine, and for a work which have been so fatal to religion in France, we have nothing but indulgence and compassion for the unhappy writer whose genius was made a tool of. Contrary to the majority of our contemporaries, we condemn the work and absolve the man; the reason is, that the work has been judged by the highest authority which exists in this world, and that no one has the right to disturb the ashes of the man, and to cite before his own tribunal his intentions and his memory.

'Son cercueil est fermé; Dieu l'a jugé; silence.'[1]

'Le vrai malheur des Jesuites au dix-septième siècle,' he says, 'a été de n'avoir pas en un Pascal.'

But from M. Maynard himself we must go on to his statements. We propose to notice the ground which he takes against Pascal, first, historically; next, as disclosing the principles which he represents as established in his own communion. It is mainly for this latter purpose that we have given so much space to the subject. It may be as well, however, at starting, though we are not dealing with the controversy in itself, to say a few words on the alleged unfairness of Pascal.

We certainly do think that his charges, on the whole, are very serious, both in their matter and evidence; and also, that they reach beyond the Jesuits. But we certainly cannot defend Pascal as M. Maynard does the Jesuits. Few persons read him without more or less of misgiving as to his perfect fairness. Indeed, it is not unnatural that after such a sweeping victory of human wit, there should come a reaction; the mind feels disposed to be sceptical whether in reality the triumph could have been as complete as it appears. It seems to violate likelihood—to be more

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 440, 441.

Digitized by Google

than Providence, which is jealous of human pride, is wont to allot to man. And this natural suspicion is not without grounds. Pascal was by no means always fair, especially in the detail of his proof.

Pascal's Letters have the exaggeration, inseparable from an able, earnest, passionate attack,—the exaggeration of a clear statement and lucid arrangement of the case *on one side;* the exaggeration of ridicule and irony; the exaggeration of strong and indignant feeling. Further, they leave unsaid how the system which they attacked grew up; how long custom, and a general use not confined to the Jesuits, if it had made this system dangerous, had also in all probability, in a measure, corrected it, as it certainly in a degree excused it: and they leave the impression, that *that* was a distinct *intention*, which was mainly a *result*, not very coyly accepted and followed up. Further, he leaves unsaid, for he did not on principle acknowledge them, the practical necessities of a popular, and much more, of a fashionable religion—much the same under all circumstances, whether resisted as temptations, or accepted as facts.

As to his quotations, the Letters, we think, will bear favourable comparison with any work that deals as largely in controversial citations. He solemnly declares that he had looked into text and context of every passage that he used; and we can see no reason to doubt his belief that he was dealing fairly. Still it is undeniable, we think, that he is at times really, and still oftener, apparently, unfair in his use of passages. We say, apparently, where in quoting, he omits restrictions and conditions which in the context accompany some startling decision, because he feels them to be mere surplusage. Where the point of a passage really remains unaltered by qualifications, which seem put in simply for verbal show, Pascal makes little ceremony in sacrificing limitations which he thinks unmeaning or trifling, to the convenience of his own statement. And besides, it must be confessed, that it was an unlucky chance for his victims, clumsy writers, singularly confident in their formal methods and their own authority—coarse and technical about refinements which almost defy words, and not dreaming of any opposition but that logical one which was the delight and business of their lives,—to fall into the hands of Pascal. The skilfully chosen, and skilfully exhibited passage, which looks so monstrous in his pages, not seldom subsides in their own into mere grotesque absurdity; often too, what really illustrates the mischief of the whole system, seems to bear hard in each separate instance when pointed against individuals. But there are cases where he is substantially unfair; we will give an instance or two.

Digitized by Google

The following is a case which has been more than once quoted against Pascal. He is speaking of the *jolies questions* which Escobar and others have framed on the subject of fasting: it may be remembered how, as they proceed, they become more and more delicate and thoughtful for the penitent, who wishes to have a good conscience and not to fast. These questions and answers are not disputed by M. Maynard. He only sneers at Escobar, or else backs him with S. Thomas. As to the man coming of age an hour after midnight, and thus having a right to be let off, he dismisses it with 'c'est subtil, ridicule, si 'on le veut, mais *c'est vrai*. Puis, en quoi cela va-t-il à la 'corruption de la morale?'—there being no harm apparently in a director of conscience, or his penitent, being shufflers. At length, Pascal comes to the following climax:—

'"O que cela est divertissant!" lui dis-je. "On ne s'en peut tirer," me repondit-il; "je passe les jours et les nuits à le lire; je ne fais autre chose." Le bon père, voyant que j'y prenais plaisir, en fut ravi; et continuant: "Voyez," dit-il, "encore ce trait de Filiutius, qui est un de ces vingt-quatre Jésuites, 'Celui qui s'est fatigué à quelque chose, comme à poursuivre une fille, *ad insequendam amicam*, est-il obligé de jeûner? Nullement. Mais s'il s'est fatigué exprès, pour être par là dispensé du jeûne, y sera-t-il tenu? Encore qu'il eût ce dessein formé, il n'y sera point obligé."'—Vol. i. p. 233.

On this M. Maynard begins his note with a triumphant chuckle:—

'*Oh! pour le coup, voilà Pascal pris en flagrant délit de falsification.* D'abord, Filiuci n'est point l'inventeur du problème. La question avait été traitée bien avant lui par S. Antonin, Sylvestre, Médina, Sancius, et beaucoup d'autres auteurs étrangers à la Compagnie. De plus, la question n'était pas oiseuse. "Si vous vous souvenez," dit à ce propos M. Sainte Beuve, (*Port-Royal*, tom. iii. p. 59,) "qu'il se présentait souvent au tribunal de la confession des pénitents bien étranges, comme Louis XI. par exemple, ou Philippe II., ou Henri III., (je parle des plus connus,) pour qui c'était une affaire sérieuse de jeûner le lendemain d'un meurtre ou d'une course libertine, vous trouverez moins étranges les précautions et distinctions que Filiutius prescrivait à la date de 1626, et qu'on retrouverait plus ou moins chez les autres Casuistes de ce temps." Et maintenant abordons le texte de Filiuci, et traduisons-le littéralement. Ce sera moins joli que chez Pascal; mais dans toute cette longue discussion, ayons le courage de prendre pour adage le vers de Boileau:

"Rien n'est beau que le vrai, le vrai seul est aimable."

"Vous demanderez en second lieu," dit-il, "si celui qui se fatiguerait à mauvaise fin, comme à tuer un homme ou à poursuivre une fille, ou à quelque chose de semblable, serait tenu au jeûne. *Je réponds*, qu'il pécherait, il est vrai, par la mauvaise fin qu'il se propose; mais que la fatigue en étant resultée, il serait exempté du jeûne: à moins, disent quelques-uns, qu'il n'eût agi en fraude de la loi; mais les autres répondent mieux, que la faute consisterait à apporter une cause de rupture du jeûne, mais que, la cause posée, il n'y serait pas tenu." Qu'a fait Pascal? Il a arraché au texte de Filiuci le milieu et la fin, pour faire croire que le Jésuite exemptait de toute faute dans les singulières circonstances qu'il décrit.

Mais non, le Jésuite, comme tout le monde, *enverrait bien un pareil homme en enfer;* seulement ce né serait pas pour n'avoir pas jeûné, ne le pouvant faire, mais pour sa crime, et pour s'être mis dans l'impossibilité de jeûner, *Et il a raison, le bon Filiuci;* car Pascal nous dira-t-il qu'un homme qui se serait fait saigner aux quatres membres pour ne pas jeûner, y serait obligé encore, malgré son épuisement complet? Allons donc, ce serait absurde! et il faut avoir un front Janséniste pour chercher à excuser Pascal comme a voulu le faire Nicole en répondant aux accusations du P. Nouet.'[1]—Vol. i. pp. 233, 234.

We will not excuse Pascal. He has left out what '*le bon Filiuci*' could ill afford to spare; the worthy man certainly does *admit* that this 'strange penitent' would sin, though not about fasting, and Pascal takes no notice of the *admission*. But the considerateness, which remembered that to such '*very strange penitents as Louis XI., Philip II. and Henry III.*' it was '*a serious affair*' to fast after a murder, or a day of debauchery, and the 'precaution' which anxiously guarded against laying on their conscience under such circumstances one sin more, and was so careful to clear the murderer from the guilt of fast-breaking, is passed over by M. Maynard too lightly.

We will give another instance. In the Seventh Letter, Pascal quotes Lessius, (de Just. l. ii. c. 9. dub. 12, 19,) as saying that a man may resent a blow with the sword, not from vengeance, but to clear his own honour. He makes Lessius responsible for this doctrine. He does not say that Lessius qualifies it, doubts about it, puts it as a matter of any question whatever, or does anything but lay it down simply as a safe and practical rule of

[1] We give another specimen of the very subtle distinction between *what leads to* a necessity, and *what follows from* a necessity, or quasi-necessity. Lessius says, 'adulter se *debito moderamine* defendens, maritum interficit; *non est reus homicidii*, sed *occisio illa censetur fortuita*.' For he says, 'the original crime is only the remote cause and occasion; and every man when he is hard pressed, is not bound to let himself be killed, but may defend himself. Then after maintaining his view, he proceeds in the following, in which we cannot help thinking of the *bonté* and *douceur* of Père Bauny's *bruleur des granges*:—' Adverte tamen, si suspicabatur adulter, *talia incommoda* [*i. e.* that he should kill the husband,] ex adulterio secutura, *tenebatur ex charitate abstinere*. Unde volendo adulterium committere, peccat non solum peccato adulterii, sed etiam *contra charitatem proximi*, quatenus per adulterium *constituit se in necessitate damni proximo inferendi; . . .* quando *tamen constitutus est* in tali periculo, *non peccat*, etiamsi se defendendo, occidat alterum; quia jus habet se defendendi. Idem dicendum, si imminente marito *poterat* fugere; tenebatur enim *ex charitate*, si videbat inde marito periculum: unde non fugiendo peccat contra charitatem proximi. *Non tamen peccat*, si postquam *non potest amplius fugere*, se defendendo, occidat invasorem: occisio enim illa, non est peccatum, sed effectus per accidens secutus ex peccato.'—*Lessius, de Just.* l. ii. c. 9. dub. 15. pp. 106, 107.

The sin *lasting on till a certain moment*, and then metaphysically vanishing, is singular enough. Still it may be taken as a philosophical analysis, whether right or wrong, yet purely speculative, of the action. On the other hand, we are told that these were not '*questions oiseuses*,' that they were *practically* necessary for delicate cases, for 'strange penitents' like Louis XI. and Philip II.

Digitized by Google

action, as Escobar may be fairly said to do. But in fact it turns out that the real state of the case is this:—1. Lessius quotes it from some one else. 2. He gives arguments, by which it, and some other maxims of the same sort, may be supported. 3. He ends by saying, in the scholastic formula, that though 'it is speculatively probable, it does not seem to be easily allowed in practice.' That is, whether mildly or not, he does distinctly condemn the maxim; first, from the danger of hatred or vengeance in the agent; second, because likely to lead to other bloodshed.

Certainly, no one reading Pascal's account would imagine that Lessius had said anything of the kind. Accordingly the Jesuits made the most of it against Pascal's good faith, and Pascal answers them in his thirteenth Letter. They said that Lessius quoted it from some one else, and quoted it to 'combat' it; Pascal, that he quoted it to 'follow' it. Lessius's style of 'combating' is of a very mild order: but Pascal is unfair nevertheless. His reply to the Jesuits, who quote *certain* words of *condemnation*, is that *these* words refer not to this case, but to another; which is true. But Pascal himself persists in shutting his eyes to the fact that Lessius had *spoken against* it, in some words, and in refusing him the benefit of what he *did* say:—'Il ne 'se trouve pas,' he maintains, '*une seule parole de condamnation* 'en ce lieu-là; *mais il parle* ainsi: '"Il semble, qu'on n'en doit 'pas *facilement* permettre la pratique: *in praxi non videtur* 'FACILE PERMITTENDA."' This he will not admit to be any sort of real condemnation.

He further suppresses the fact, that he himself had originally taken no notice, except in *a general way*, of this limitation. And he tries very unfairly to weaken the force of the words themselves, a technical form of disapproval. Thus he begins with charging Lessius with inventing and maintaining a maxim, and he ends by really proving against him only that he discountenanced it in too mild language.

This is unfair. But in this, as in most other instances, if we criticise the accuser's fairness, the case of the accused is not much mended. An inspection of the text only conveys more vividly the cool way in which Lessius entertains and has difficulties about the doubt, whether we may kill a man for a blow. M. Maynard is still better, and gives us the reason for Lessius' hesitating and faint rejection,—*videtur non facile permittenda*. 'If,' says he, 'Lessius does not speak more expressly, *it is out of* 'respect for Victoria (from whom he quotes); when he treats of 'murdering for *calumny*, he absolutely condemns the practice, 'n'étant *gêné-là* par *aucune autorité*.' (Vol. ii. p. 135.)

We will add a third case, where unfairness seems to arise from

Digitized by Google

the two parties being at cross purposes. The Roman system is a great system of external legislation, yet bearing intimately on conscience. On the one hand, it must wear the technical form of ordinary law. The crimes it denounces have to be defined; the rules which apply to all penal enactments must govern and abridge its severity. But, on the other hand, it appeals to more than outward obedience; it claims the submission of the Christian in his conscience, as it is meant to provide for the good direction of his religious life; its penalties are assumed to touch his soul, even though applied by the rules of human punishment.[1] This was the long-established system in the Church to which Pascal, as well as the Jesuits, belonged. But in several of the questions between him and his answerers, each drops one side of this double system. He assumes solely its *practical object;* that Pope's Bulls, for instance, when they denounce, and enact punishment against, some particular crime, are to be taken in a broad and common-sense view, as intending as hard a blow as can be given against the crime in all its forms; and so he quotes, as specimens of explaining away authorities, in order to favour crime, cases where terms are defined, or penalties restricted. The Jesuits and their friends bring for answer, the necessary *method and practice* of such a system as the Canon law. Thus Pascal shows from Escobar, that a man who murders, not for money, but to oblige his friend, is not to be called an assassin:—

'Le Pape Grég. XIV. a déclaré que les assassins sont indignes de jouir de l'asile des églises, et qu'on doit les en arracher. Cependant nos vingt-quatres vieillards disent, que tous ceux qui tuent en trahison ne doivent pas encourir la peine de cette bulle. Cela vous paraît être contraire; mais on l'accorde, en interprétant le mot d'*assassin*, comme ils le font par ces paroles. "Les assassins ne sont-ils pas indignes de jouir du privilége des églises par la bulle de Grég. XIV. Mais nous entendons par le mot d'assassins ceux qui ont reçu de l'argent pour tuer quelqu'un en trahison. D'où il arrive que ceux qui tuent sans en recevoir aucun prix, mais seulement pour obliger leurs amis, ne sont pas appelés assassins."'—Lett. VI. vol. i. p. 254.

Now the result of this interpretation certainly is, either that *real* assassins get off, or that people may with truth think that he who is not *canonically* an assassin, is not a *real* assassin. Yet it is fair to remember, as M. Maynard reminds us, that it is primarily a question of legal definition. 'The privilege of 'sanctuary,' he says, 'has always been regarded in Italy as 'very important."[2] Abuses occurred, and were restrained by

[1] 'Idem pontifex refert, quod Innoc. X. et Innoc. XII. *excommunicationem* inflixerunt, in eos qui in Ecclesiâ Vaticanâ *tabacum sumerent;* et eandem imposuit Urban. VIII. pro ecclesiis Hispanicis: sed Bened. XIII. omnes istas prohibitiones abstulit.'—*Liguori, Hom. Ap.* Tr. xv. p. iii. No. 38.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 254, 255.

Digitized by Google

bulls and censures; and the extent of these restraints gave further occasion to disputes between Churches and magistrates. This had to be settled as the interpretation of other legal terms —who were *assassins* in the view of the bull? And in penal matters, the maxim is, '*odiosa sunt restringenda et rigores applicanda.*' The effect of this mixture of civil and spiritual perils—of excommunication and hanging—in this system, is a fair question. But it is not the question that Pascal is here dealing with.

We might add other instances of summary and unfair ways of dealing with what he attacked. Pascal was as unceremonious or unscrupulous as powerful and earnest minds are apt to be in dealing with what they not only detest, but thoroughly despise. When he had made up his mind that he must be unsparing, he did not stop to think whether he made his victim too absurd. But the main question still remains. Pascal may have been guilty of more or less unfairness; under the disguise of a man of the world, he may have had in him a good deal of the partizan, and something of the Puritan. Still it is a question whether the state of things he alleges to have existed was substantially true; and if so, we may be excused for being curious to see how a modern French ecclesiastic volunteers to deal with it, especially when he presents his labours with considerable pomp, in all the luxury of typographical elegance, and introduces it to the world with the 'favourable opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority in France.' We take it up not to go over the quarrels of the past, but to learn the principles and views of the present.

We shall find, that, first, he denies the existence, as a fact, of this corrupt moral teaching among the Jesuits, or indeed in the Church; and next, that he supports his assertion by absolutely identifying the teaching of the Jesuits at that day with the teaching of the Church at this. The question then remains, as to the view which he presents, of the nature of this teaching. These three points we shall attempt to illustrate as we proceed, and in this order.

First, as to the fact on which Pascal's attack rests, the existence and influence of a system of easy Casuisty. M. Maynard, as we have said, broadly denies it. There was nothing, he maintains, in the morals or the teaching of the period to warrant it; far less in that of the Jesuits. 'It is absurd,' he says, 'to suppose of the Society of Jesus that they taught bad "doctrine."' . . . 'Never was there a society, perhaps, which takes 'more precautions to maintain the purity of its doctrine and 'morality, and which, with this view, has recourse to rules more 'severe, and, it may be said, more exactly observed.' Nor will he allow of the distinction between the earlier and later Jesuits.

Digitized by Google

They strike him, on the contrary, by their unity of purpose and character. He quotes instances of their boldness and severity in the court of France:—'En un mot, les Jésuites transigèrent-'ils *une seule fois* avec l'immoralité dans la voluptueuse cour de 'Versailles?' They harassed—P. Annat, especially, it is said in Bayle,[1] '*chagrinait tous les jours*'—Louis XIV.; '*lui per-'mirent-ils jamais* de *conserver le dehors de la religion et de s'ap-'procher des sacrements*, tant qu'il était livré à ses scandaleuses 'amours?' . . . 'Courage autant plus digne d'éloge, que chacun 'était pris d'admiration, ou du moins se taisait devant ces brillants 'désordres.' . . . 'Toutes les courtisanes eurent les Jésuites pour 'persécuteurs.'[2] 'All the efforts,' he observes, 'which they made 'at the time of the *Provinciales* to refute the slanders of Pascal, 'prove clearly that the doctrines ascribed to them were not those 'which they applied to the direction of souls. One only among 'them, Père Pirot, wanted to defend them, and he was disavowed 'by his brethren.'[3] And what inducement had they to do otherwise? 'Eh! mon Dieu,' exclaims their defender; 'quel intérêt 'auraient donc eu les Jésuites à favoriser de tels crimes, eux si 'purs, qu'ils pourraient presque dire à leurs ennemis, avec l'au-'teur de toute innocence: *Quis ex vobis arguat me de peccato?*'[4] There was, in reality, 'as has been so well observed by Comte de Maistre, no *parti de la morale relâchée* in the Church.'[5]

Now, the report of history and common belief is, that there was,—and that it was found among the Jesuits. Not, as Voltaire puts it, and the Abbé after him, a party with the deliberate plan to corrupt morals,—which, as Voltaire observes, and might have recollected before he fathered absurdities on Pascal, 'no society ever had, or can have,'—but a party formed for the purpose of directing morals, and which, in directing them, allowed them great liberties; a party which urged virtue where they could, but compromised, on principle, with disobedience, where they could not. Pascal has made no improbable charge, and has taken care to state it in terms which keep clear of the desirable exaggeration. He has but described, in the most exquisitely organized specimen of a party, the natural malady of all parties, even religious ones; and its effects, when exhibited on so large a scale.

'Sachez donc que leur objet n'est pas de corrompre les mœurs; ce n'est pas leur dessein. Mais ils n'ont pas aussi pour unique but celui de les reformer; ce serait une mauvaise politique. Voici quelle est leur pensée. *Ils ont assez bonne opinion d'eux-mêmes pour croire qu'il est utile et comme néces-*

[1] 'Il est dit *dans* Bayle.' M. Maynard weighs his words; *in* Bayle, not *by* Bayle, but by the writer of a '*fabulous and satirical*' work, from which Bayle quotes the passage referred to, for the purpose of showing up its anachronisms.

[2] Vol. i. pp. 178—180. [3] Vol. i. p. 209. [4] Vol. i. p. 264.

[5] Vol. i. p. 185.

Digitized by Google

saire au bien de la religion que leur crédit s'étende partout, et qu'ils gouvernent toutes les consciences. Et parceque les maximes évangéliques et sévères sont propres pour gouverner quelques sortes de personnes, ils s'en servent dans ces occasions où elles leur sont favorables. Mais comme ces mêmes maximes ne s'accordent pas au dessein de la plupart des gens, ils les laissent à l'égard de ceux-là, afin d'avoir de quoi satisfaire tout le monde. C'est pour cette raison qu'ayant affaire à des personnes de toutes sortes de conditions et de nations si différentes, il est nécessaire qu'ils aient de Casuistes assortis à toute diversité. . . . C'est par cette conduite *obligéante et accommodante,* comme l'appelle le Père Pétau, qu'ils tendent les bras à tout le monde.'—Lett. V. vol. i. pp. 218, 219.

Pascal may be elsewhere carried beyond this, in his disgust or indignation; and here he speaks as a partizan, when he implies that their 'severe directors' were but few—merely enough for a bait. M. Maynard has a right to remind us of the bright side of the Jesuits—of what they did for literature and piety—how, when Pères Annat, and Pinthereau, and Bauny were speculating or calling names in Paris, their brethren were dying at the stake of the Hurons, or under the sword of the Chinese—how the very Père Garasse, the buffoon of the *Provinciales*, asked, as a special favour, to wait on the plague-stricken people at Orleans, and died among them, and one of them. But Pascal is not unfair, if his facts are true, in making the Society, whose boasted excellence was its perfection of government, and absolute control over the very thoughts and will of its members, responsible for all that it sanctioned. The world heard a good deal, from itself, of its singular merit in this matter. It was only taking it at its word, if Pascal fixes on it what its superiors allowed their subjects to print, and obtrude with no little ostentation on the Church; if he assumes that 'un si grand corps ne 'subsisterait pas dans une conduite téméraire, et sans une âme 'qui le gouverne, et qui régle tous ses mouvements.'[1] Once for all it must be said, that even in his hands the charge was not, that the Jesuit institute had not great virtues, but that it had also great vices: '*neque virtute propriâ tantum profuerunt, quan-* '*tum in hoc nocuerunt, quod aliorum virtutem corruperint et per-* '*diderint.*'

[1] 'Outre,' he proceeds, 'qu'ils ont un ordre particulier de ne rien imprimer sans l'aveu de leurs supérieurs.' 'Pascal,' answers M. Maynard, 'donne à l'approbation à laquelle sont soumis, en vertu des constitutions de S. Ignace, tous les ouvrages de ses membres, un valeur et une signification chimérique. D'abord, cette approbation est imposée communement à tous les ouvrages réligieux. Quant aux Jésuites, ce n'est pas le général qui lit les ouvrages . . . mais le provincial, aidé de deux ou trois examinateurs, *qui se conforment dans leur jugement aux doctrines des divers pays où ils se trouvent.* Ce jugement en conséquence n'est pas plus l'impression des idées de la Société, qu'il n'est irréfragable.'—Vol. i. p. 210. It hardly does for M. Maynard to call this giving '*une valeur et signification chimérique*' to the licensing of books, when in the next page he argues from the rigour and practical success of the precautions taken, the absurdity of supposing that bad doctrine could have found its way into the order.

Digitized by Google

As to the evidence, we will only say that others of great name and authority besides Pascal spoke, at the time, as strongly as he did, both of the existence and dangers of this accommodating morality, as a feature of the time; and further, we will venture to engage that no one at this day, except he felt his position already compromised by it, would any more dream of saying a word in its justification, than he would of committing himself to the physics of the schoolmen, or the political maxims of Machiavelli. It was not Pascal who said,—'*Certes, je ne vois rien dans le monde qui soit plus à charge à l'Eglise, que ces esprits vainement subtils, qui réduisent tout l'Evangile en problèmes, qui forment des incidents sur l'exécution de ses préceptes, qui fatiguent les casuistes par des consultations infinies, qui ne travaillent, en vérité, qu'à nous envelopper la règle des mœurs. Plus malheureux encore les docteurs indignes de ce nom, qui adhèrent à leurs sentiments, et donnent du poids à leurs folies. Ces sont des astres errants . . . ils confondent le ciel et la terre, et mêlent Jésus-Christ avec Bélial; mélange indigne de la piété Chrétienne; union monstrueuse qui déshonore la vérité, la simplicité, la pureté incorruptible du Christianisme.*' Pascal never said anything stronger: yet it was no Jansenist who wrote these words, but Bossuet, who goes on in the next paragraph to condemn with equal severity the rigour of the Jansenists: Bossuet, the man of strong good sense and impartial justice—Bossuet, in his panegyric on the very theologian, who first extracted and denounced the *Five Propositions* of Jansenius, the Grand Master of the College of Navarre, Nicolas Cornet—Bossuet, himself a director, and not an extravagantly severe one, celebrating the praises of another director, 'whom all France knew, for he was consulted by all France,'—a theologian of the 'ancient mark,' as hostile to impracticable and 'affected' rigour, as to laxity and 'affected ignorance.' It was Nicolas Cornet, the enemy of Jansenism, who, according to Bossuet, showed himself equally implacable to those maxims, '*moitié profanes et moitié saintes, moitié Chrétiennes et moitié mondaines; ou plutôt toutes mondaines et toutes profanes, parce qu'elles ne sont qu'à demi-Chrétiennes et à demi-saintes.*'

'Nicolas Cornet,' he goes on to say, 'n'a jamais trouvé belles aucunes des couleurs de la *Simonie* . . . Il a condamné *l'usure* sous tous ses noms, et sous tous ses titres. Sa pudeur a toujours rougi de tous les *prétextes honnêtes des engagements déshonnêtes*, où il n'a épargné le fer et le feu pour éviter les périls des *occasions prochaines*. Les inventeurs trop subtils des *vaines contentions et questions de néant, qui ne servent qu'à faire perdre, parmi des détours infinis, la trace toute droite de la vérité*, lui ont paru, aussi bien qu'à S. Augustin, des hommes inconsidérés et volages—"*sufflantes pulverem et excitantes terram in oculos suos.*" *Ces chicanes raffinées, ces subtilités en vaines distinctions*, sont véritablement de la poussière soufflée, de la terre dans les

Digitized by Google

yeux, qui ne font que troubler la vue. Enfin il n'a écouté aucun expédient pour accorder l'esprit et la chair, entre lesquels nous avons appris que la guerre doit être immortelle."[1]

So wrote Bossuet in 1663. After an interval of many years, we find him still in the same mind. In the General Assembly of 1700 we find him urging, with all the earnestness and force of his character, the condemnation by the authority of the whole French Church of those 'monstrous opinions, which had so long 'caused scandal to the Church and to Europe, and which 'offended the sanctity of Christian morality in its purest and 'most certain maxims;' and he adds that, 'Si, contre toute 'vraisemblance, et par des considérations qu'il ne voulait ni 'supposer ni admettre, l'Assemblée se refusait à prononcer un 'jugement digne de l'Eglise Gallicane, *seul, il révèlerait la voix 'dans un si pressant danger; seul, il révèlerait à toute la terre 'une si honteuse prévarication; seul, il publierait la censure de tant 'd'erreurs monstrueuses.*'[2] Could Pascal have said more?

Bossuet saw a '*parti de la morale relâchée*' in the Church. He talked, as M. Maynard tells us, of 'two dangerous maladies 'which had afflicted in his days the body of the Church—one 'an extreme severity; the other, *une malheureuse et inhumaine 'complaisance, qui a pris quelques docteurs, une pitié meurtrière, 'qui leur a fait porter des coussins sous les coudes de pécheurs, 'chercher des couvertures à leurs passions, pour condescendre à 'leur vanité, et flatter leur ignorance affectée.*' And where did he find these doctors, whom, at the close of his career, he thought it his duty to impeach before the assembled Clergy of France? M. Maynard shall interpret Bossuet's words, for he named no one.[3] It was among the Jesuits—the Jesuits, whom as an order he honoured, and among whom he had many friends.

But was it fair to lay all this on the Jesuits? It is true that Pascal attacked as peculiar to the Jesuits a system of casuistry

---

[1] Bossuet, 'Oraison Funèbre de Nicolas Cornet,' 1663, vol. xi. pp. 201, 203.

[2] Bausset, 'Hist. de Bossuet,' l. xi. No. 7.

[3] 'These ideas prevailed in the Assembly of 1700—a great number of propositions were there denounced as being the doctrine of a party dangerous to Catholic morality. This was, on the part of the Jansenists of the Assembly, a lie; a mistake, and blind acquiescence, on the part of the rest, and even of Bossuet. How could Bossuet have said, that, if people spoke against Jansenism, without at the same time repressing the errors of the other party, the manifest iniquity of so visible a partiality would make men despise such a judgment, and think that there was the wish to spare half the evil? . . . What was this *other party?* Bossuet talked, indeed, *of priests and religions, of all orders and all habits,* but he used the words as a blind; and, in spite of this prudent generalization, no one could be understood but the Jesuits, who alone had been the subjects of discussion for half a century, and whose authors had furnished nearly all the propositions submitted to the censure. It is true that Louis XIV. forbad the mention by name of the Jesuits in the censure, but all the world understood perfectly well who was meant.' —Vol. i. pp. 185, 186.

Digitized by Google

run to seed, which was pursued by theologians of other orders, and which was at least highly respected by the authorities of the Church. But it is true also, that no order did so much with it as the Jesuits. No order pursued it so systematically, with so much zest, and such unintermitting purpose.[1] It was one of their instruments in gaining that reputation of which no order ever made such parade,—the reputation for skill in directing consciences. They had no right to complain that the '*Praxis secundum Societatis Jesu*,' should be presented in as prominent and strong a light by others as the boasts of the '*Imago primi sæculi*' had been by themselves. They had no right to decline the odium of representing casuistry, who had claimed its first honours.

M. Maynard starts, as we see, with denying *in toto* the historical fact of the corruption either of doctrine or morals. But we shall understand him better when we know what principles guide his judgment. What Pascal thought once of putting into the mouth of his '*bon père*,'—'*Accordez-moi ce principe, que la Société et l'Eglise courent même fortune, et je vous prouverai tout*,'[2]—expresses without irony M. Maynard's view. That the Jesuits could not have been wrong, he maintains, follows from the broad fact that their doctrines were simply those of the Church. He states it as incontestable that what the Jesuits held, and their opponents attacked,—making allowance for open questions and individual mistakes, corrected as soon as noticed,—was but what every good Catholic now takes for granted. He lays down in strong terms, that in reality the '*Jesuits have no doctrine of their own.* They attach 'themselves *immovably to the decisions of the Church*; for the 'rest, either they follow the doctrines which are *most commonly* '*authorized*, or in case of a divergence of opinions, they em-'brace the sentiment which pleases each, in all the liberty of 'thought.'[3]

Thus with the famous doctrine of Probability. As Pascal represents it, it is a curious perversion of the principle of authority—the application of it to legitimatize doubt and licence. M. Maynard states, as its characteristic rule, that you may follow the *less* probable, as well as the *less* safe side, provided it is really probable. Such a rule is obviously vague enough to admit any application, from the boldest truism to the most barefaced quibble. As expounded by Liguori, the S. Thomas of the modern school, it seems to be simply a theory to provide for and justify the natural and legitimate liberty of individual acts.

[1] Ste. Beuve, vol. iii. p. 67. [2] Faugère, Fragments, vol. i. p. 297.
[3] Vol. i. p. 211.

Digitized by Google

It does not seem to come to more than that when a *law* is uncertain, a man is not bound to its most rigid sense, but is left freely to other guidance. It is a poor and clumsy theory, based on the application to human life in general, of the maxims of equitable interpretation of *law* between man and man, or subject and ruler. But it does not present the singular features of Pascal's representation. It is otherwise, however, when we turn to the Casuists from whom he drew. There we recognise what he describes; there, what is prominent is, not the scope and purport of the theory, but the *practical idea and test of what is probable*, and its value in settling questions of conscience. There, the common sense rule of following a wiser or better man than ourselves when we can do nothing better, is turned into a universal and exclusive basis for conscience, and expanded into logical consequences. There we find it argued, that since it is prudent to trust those who are *in arte sua periti*, and to submit to the judgment of the wise and good, therefore it is prudent to follow Sanchez, and seventeen wise and good authors, whom he quotes, to prove the general maxim, that it is lawful in conscience to leave the *more* and follow the *less* probable opinion, even if it is less safe; that an opinion is *probable* which rests on a reason of some weight; that therefore the opinion of one good and learned doctor is probable, because such authority is not light but weighty; that one learned man may make his opinion, even to the unlearned who trusts him, more probable than the common opinion;—that the general opinion of the more recent authors cuts off, in general, appeal to older ones, as their vigilance is a sufficient guarantee that no error would be allowed to creep in;—that the same person may judge two opposite opinions equally probable.[1] Many common sense ways of acting might indeed come under these rules; but it is equally plain, that thus broadly stated, as exclusive or leading rules of any man's mind, they will lead him a long way, at least from common sense. They *may* mean anything; and their writers take no trouble to show that they *do not* mean the 'leaden rule' which they seem.

What does M. Maynard? He tells us that it was not a Jesuit but a Dominican invention, in 1598, which immediately was adopted universally in the Catholic schools, where all theologians were '*tenants passionés du Probabilisme.*'[2] He gives his own

[1] Filliuc. Tr. xxi. c. 4. nn. 128—137. ('*Pénitencier du Pape à S. Pierre, et Casuiste en Chef du Saint-Office,*' Mayn. ii. 456.)

[2] Pascal might have seen a new illustration of its principles in the fact, that, according to M. Maynard, 'there was no religious order from whence issued such solid dissertations against it;' yet when Gonzalez wanted to publish his, so warmly was the company in general attached to the opinion, that they would not permit him; and Innocent XI. interposed his supreme authority in vain, *pour vaincre les opiniâtretés;* and even when Gonzalez became General of the Order, he had to publish not as General, but as an individual doctor.

Digitized by Google

exposition of 'Probabilism,' guarding it by cautions as vague as its rules. He admits Pascal's quotations. He makes no attempt to disprove his inferences, or allow us to judge by extracts whether the tone and spirit of the originals seem against them. But he charges him generally with misrepresentation, and tells us that his own, the Jesuits', and Liguori's view are all one with that of the Church. It is rather hard upon Pascal, considering that the very 'abuses' which the Church had to condemn were those which some Jesuits had allowed to pass current, and he had attacked.

'True Probabilism, which Pascal has so strangely misrepresented, confined within these limits, the Church has not condemned, nor will ever condemn; and recently she has yet further placed it out of *the reach of any censure, by placing on her altars S. Liguori*, who has, nevertheless, *carried out its consequences to the very utmost.*[1] *In fact, apart from certain propositions condemned in some Jesuit writers, who had themselves borrowed them from older authors, there is the greatest analogy between the theology of S. Liguori and that with which Pascal reproaches the Society; since both one and the other are based on Probabilism, regard the diversity of opinions as allowed, useful, and even necessary; and since, moreover, the holy bishop draws from these common principles, in the way of inference, a great number of the propositions condemned in the "Petites Lettres" as subversive of all morality.* The Church has confined itself to restraining the *abuses of Probabilism*, by condemning those propositions which reduced to nothing the conditions of true probability, or extended the application of the system to matters to which it is inapplicable, or drew from it forced consequences. . . . . But the Church has never touched Probabilism itself; and if the Assembly of 1700 has disapproved of it, it did not pass any censure on it.'—Vol. i. pp. 197—199.

The Jesuits, M. Maynard maintains, never were, — never *would* be mistaken, except in the very best company in the Church. If they are wrong, he always takes care to say that they had *borrowed*. There is something quite amusing in the eagerness with which he transfers to the Church or her great doctors the responsibility of what Pascal attributes to the Jesuits. You cannot point out a reproach against the Jesuits,—seems to be constantly his language,—but I will find its match elsewhere, and that in the highest quarters. If the Jesuits are reproached for extravagant self-laudation in their book, '*Imago Primi Sæculi*,' M. Maynard tells us that Franciscans and Dominicans were not only equally absurd, but impious, in the same way. After apologising for the legitimate enthusiasm and poetic feelings of the young Jesuits who composed it—a family trophy of the Order—and

[1] 'It is well known that in the process of canonization all the writings of the person are examined with the most minute and most severe attention; and if there be found in them one single proposition contrary to the faith or sound morality, the cause proceeds no further, and is stopped for ever.'—(*Maynard's note.*)

Digitized by Google

reprobating the '*cruelty*' '*qu'il y avait à se moquer de cette* '*tendresse filiale des enfants pour leur mère, à flétrir ce bonheur* '*de famille, à étouffer cette ardeur juvenile qui s'élançait avec* '*tant de confiance vers le bel avenir,*' &c., M. Maynard observes that Franciscans and Dominicans did worse without exciting remark:—

'Comment les Jansenistes ne voulurent-ils pas se souvenir des "*Conformités de la Vie de S. François à la Vie de Jésus-Christ,*" par F. Barthélemy de Pise, *ouvrage extravagant et même impie;* de l' "*Origo Seraphica Familiæ Franciscanæ,*" du Capucin Gonzague; des "*Entrailles de la Ste. Vierge pour l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs,*" du Dominician Chouques? Mais sous ce rapport, comme sous tous les autres, ce qui était excusable, même légitime, chez les enfants de S. François ou de S. Dominique, était un crime chez les fils de Loyola.'—Vol. i. p. 217.

There were Casuists, too, in the Church, he says, besides the Jesuits, and Casuists who said as strange things, though Pascal keeps it out of sight;—which, however, he scarcely did;—and the Jesuits did but follow out and perfect what had high and abundant sanction elsewhere. The Père Daniel, says M. Maynard, was able, doubtless not without some zest, to substitute for the *Jesuit* quotations in the Fifth *Provinciale* names and extracts of *Dominicans*, their keen rivals. 'Rappelons-nous,' he says, after Voltaire, (and—if the question of *degree*, and of the organization and power of the Jesuits, is set aside—with truth,) 'que les 'opinions reprochées aux Jésuites ne leur étaient point particu-'lières, et qu'en leur substituant *toutes les Universités de* '*l'Europe, tous les ordres religieux qui existaient au dix-septième* '*siècle, on aurait pu dire aussi bien des docteurs de Sorbonne, de* '*Louvain, de Salamanque, des religieux de S. Dominique et de* '*S. François, tout ce que dit Pascal des Jésuites dans les Pro-*'*vinciales.*'[1] Thus, for instance, when Pascal quotes from Escobar, how you may hear mass in a very short time, namely, 'by hearing *different* portions of four masses simultaneously,' M. Maynard, in reply, points out to us that we must not smile: the opinion of which this is a consequence was considerable enough to have a history and growth, and at last the honour of a special limitation. *Dignus vindice nodus.* Viewing it as he does, we shall see in it and the kindred questions, a logical following out of certain truth—mistaken, indeed, as it has turned out, but which seemed so undeniable to all the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that no one ventured to oppose it except with the utmost hesitation. Thus Azor '*embraced with repugnance*' that 'two successive halves made one mass,'—'*entraîné, dit-il, par le nombre et le poids des autorités;*' and those who, like the Jesuits Suarez and Lugo,

[1] Vol. i. p. 212.

Digitized by Google

resisted the torrent, looked with alarm at the array of great names against them,—'se montrent *effrayés* de l'autorité et du nombre de ses défenseurs.' If it is not so now, it is because Innocent XI. proscribed it; since which time, no theologian has defended it. We may admire, in passing, the singular mode of thought which affects not to be able to see the right and wrong of such a question, except by going to the Pope's decision; and excuses the wrong opinion as quite defensible, till condemned by him.

'Ces diverses décisions ne sont pas également absurdes. *Il a été longtemps reçu, parmi les théologiens,* qu'on satisfaisait au précepte par l'audition successive de deux moitiés de messe; et ce sentiment, quoique faux, n'a jamais été condamné. *Puis on a prétendu* que cela serait vrai *quand même l'ordre des parties serait interverti. Enfin,* par une *mauvaise conséquence d'une doctrine certaine,* qu'on peut satisfaire simultanément au précepte de l'audition de la messe et au précepte de la récitation de l'office divin, et d'une *doctrine probable* qu'on satisfait par l'audition d'une seule messe à une triple obligation, provenant, par exemple, du précepte ecclésiastique, d'un vœu, de la pénitence sacramentelle, *on en est venu* à soutenir qu'on pouvait simultanément entendre deux ou plusieurs parties de messe, *ce qui détruit entièrement l'intégrité du sacrifice.* Cette doctrine a été proscrite par Innocent XI. (59me Prop.), [*Satisfacit præcepto Ecclesiæ de audiendo sacro qui duas ejus partes, imo quatuor, simul a diversis celebrantibus audit;*]—et depuis aucun théologien ne l'a défendu. Mais elle était auparavant *fort commune, car on la trouve ainsi formulée dans presque tous les auteurs du seizième et du commencement du dix-septième siècle,* Soto, Navarre, Medina, [Dominicans,] et ceux même qui embrassent un sentiment contraire, comme les Jésuites Suarez et De Lugo, se montrent *effrayés* de l'autorité et du nombre de ses défenseurs. Remarquons pourtant qu'on n'en faisait l'application qu'au précepte de l'Eglise; et que ses partisans eux-mêmes généralement en condamnaient la pratique.'—Vol. i. p. 439.

'O mon père!' cries Pascal also, *tout effrayé,* as he says,—and as a Frenchman well might be,—at the list of distinguished Casuists with extraordinary names cited by his *bon père*[1]—'O mon père! *tous ces gens-là, étaient-ils Chrétiens?*' '*Comment, Chrétiens!*' is the tart reply; 'ne vous disais-je que 'ce sont les seuls par lesquels nous gouvernons aujourd'hui 'toute la Chrétienté?' M. Maynard is not pleased with the joke. 'Ces noms barroques,' he says, 'que cite ici Pascal, et 'qu'il livre à la risée publique, sont ceux des docteurs encore 'estimés par tous les théologiens, de saints évêques, et même 'd'hommes de génie, comme Suarez.' There is truth and pertinence in the remark. It is Pascal against the great names of the Roman Church: he must be wrong, because he attacked them.

But it is convenient, in a conflict of diversified aspect, to have friends of different sorts, both too great to be attacked, and also not too great to be sacrificed; the one, to bear down

[1] Lett. V.

Digitized by Google

charges in the general, the other, to carry them off when they become pressing, in the particular. Vasquez and Suarez may confound Pascal by their imposing authority; still there are quotations for which the other sort are useful. He always thinks of Escobar and Bauny being obscure writers when he comes to some inconvenient quotation. 'Bauny is *not* a *savant Casuiste*,' he says, testily, when Pascal's Jesuit, *ce stupide interlocuteur de Pascal*, describes him as '*pénétrant dans le pour et le contre d'une même question, et trouvant raison partout.*'[1] Escobar is a *bonhomme, qui a trop, beaucoup trop écrit.* He gets quite impatient with such authorities. '*Encore Bauny! Que c'est ennuyeux.*'—'*Escobar, toujours Escobar, et rien qu'Escobar.*' What is Escobar, flanked by Bauny, to represent the Society? In Escobar and Bauny, he finds all that it is necessary to give up. Not that this, after all, is very much; for the reason is always at hand, that their words are quoted by Pascal in an '*abstraction scandalisante*;' that the point of them was blunted by restrictions and conditions; that confessors knew what was meant; that they expressed themselves ill. But when Escobar decides that 'a man may satisfy the Church precept by going to mass, with the intention also of indulging bad thoughts;'[2] or a 'judge receive bribes to pay particular attention to a cause;'[3] or 'that a man may evade the law of fasting in certain cases, for 'the reason that no one is bound to alter the order of his 'meals;'[4] and when Bauny blunders into awkward vagueness about '*occasions prochaines*,'[5] or says that if a man begs a soldier to beat his neighbour or burn his barn, he is not bound to compensation, because it is not his act—he not having *forced* the soldier to do it, whom nothing obliged but his own *bonté, douceur, facilité*—M. Maynard gives up such decisions, and laughs with Pascal[6] at the *bonté* and *douceur* of the burner of barns,—'*for there is nothing else to be done.*' But he insists, that from such insignificant authorities no harm could ever come. The obvious answer is, that, whether absurd or not, they were popular. P. Bauny's *Somme des Péchés*, a large book of a thousand pages,[7] was in a sixth edition. '*A qui la faute, si ce n'est à vous, qui lui avez donné sa célébrité?*' says M. Maynard, when Pascal talks of the many reprints of Escobar; there might possibly be some colour in the rejoinder, if we were not informed, on other authority, that, of the *forty-two* editions of Escobar, forty-one appeared *before*, and one *after*, the date of the *Provinciales*.[8]

[1] Vol. i. p. 284. [2] Vol. i. p. 437. [3] Vol. i. pp. 353, 351. [4] Vol. i. p. 231.
[5] Vol. i. p. 236. [6] Vol. i. p. 367. [7] Vol. i. p. 293.

[8] 'La cherté ou du moins la curiosité s'y mit en effet. Escobar avait été imprimé quarante-et-une fois avant 1656: il le fut une quarante-deuxième fois en 1656, grâce aux Provinciales.'—Ste. Beuve, vol. iii. p. 52. Hallam, vol. ii. p. 500, speaks of forty editions, and gives the date 1646.

But even Escobar and Bauny M. Maynard is loth to resign to the cruelties of Pascal. 'Mon Dieu!' he cries, 'la doctrine de Bauny fut-elle si relâchée,'[1] that Pascal should risk the honour of the priesthood by revealing his eccentric decisions to the world? '*Nous avions pitié de ce pauvre père Bauny*, 'si maltraité par Pascal, et qu'à *notre grand regret* nous serons 'obligé de condamner nous-mêmes en d'autres circonstances.' So of Escobar, he draws a touching, and possibly a true picture, as a man of boundless and not very accurate labour, undertaken with the kindest intentions, and, like many other good men, perfectly unconscious that, with so much learning, he could say anything ridiculous or mischievous. It is at least a very probable representation. Doubtless Escobar would never have written as he did, but for greater men than Escobar, who set the fashion and showed him the way. Escobar was obviously a man who would never have dreamed of going beyond the spirit or ideas of the atmosphere in which he worked, or the authorities who were his daily and nightly study, and in whom his profound admiration saw a counterpart to the Apocalyptic Vision. If he improved upon them, he had learned from those whom he surpassed the taste for improving on them. He could not understand what harm or what excess there could be in decisions which, in full accordance with a received system, he made in pure charity.[2] He was astonished, we are told, at his *triste célébrité*. But he is none the worse a representative of what the system of speculating on morality, and that for the practical purposes of the confessional, had been allowed to come to. He showed the use that could be made of the Casuists, as Pascal's conversations show the use that *could be* made of such men as Escobar, (for the *Père Jésuite* of the Letters is a dramatized Escobar,) and, we must add, from the plain historical facts of the period, the use that *was* made of them. And after all, even Escobar is an authority. 'Enfin 'Saint Liguori cite avec respect *la plupart des Casuistes de* '*Pascal*, et même Escobar, l'homme *aux vingt-quatre vieillards*, '*et aux quatre animaux*.'[3]

In truth, we must take the liberty of thinking that it is ludicrous to suppose that Escobar would have been allowed to go on writing, and booksellers to go on reprinting, these curious questions and answers, if he had said anything that was so very repugnant to the current notions of those in power in the Order, or in the Church itself. Quite another account would have been given of him if his licences and eccentricities had taken another turn, if he had spoken of the right and sanctions of ecclesiastical precepts, as he did of the *way of satisfying* them;

[1] Vol. i. pp. 284, 285. [2] Vol. ii. p. 454. [3] Vol. i. p. 208.

Digitized by Google

if he had taken the explanatory liberties with the Pope's divine right he did with the modes of fasting and hearing mass, or had been as vague in his doctrine about transubstantiation as about '*occasions prochaines.*' Writers did not escape the censure, because they were small people. P. Bauny was, in fact, put in the *Index*. As for himself, *ce pauvre Père Bauny*, 'ce bon père, 'si commode, dont on disait, en le voyant, *Ecce qui tollit peccata* 'mundi!' it must be said that he snapped his fingers at the *Index*: '*Qu'a de commun la censure de Rome avec celle de France?*' a remark which, as M. Maynard informs us, 'tient à 'un principe *Gallican*, que nous n'aimons pas, *mais toléré par* '*Rome elle-même*, que l'*Index* n'oblige pas en France.' But according to M. Maynard's view, it was mainly its Erastianism, not its laxity, that led to its condemnation at Rome:—

'Ici on doit remarquer qu'un livre est quelquefois mis à l'*Index* pour une *simple formalité omise* dans l'impression, ou bien *pour quelque principe peu conforme à certaines maximes des Casuistes d'Italie, par exemple, celui du P. Bauny touchant la juridiction des officiers civils sur les clercs; et il paraît qu'on apporta ce motif* pour presser la censure de la Somme des Péchés; ce qui n'empêche pas cependant que cet ouvrage ne soit condamnable à d'autres égards, et ne renferme quelques propositions relâchées qui lui valurent la réprobation des évêques de France.'—Vol. i. p. 148.

This, however, according to M. Maynard, is the state of the fact. The Jesuits held nothing but what the Church holds, and therefore have a right to throw their responsibility on her. But the most important point yet remains. What does he tell us of the standard itself, to which he brings these doctrines? In the Letters, an easy theory of religion is contrasted with a strict one. Does M. Maynard mean that the Jesuit theory could not have been the easy one, because it was that of the Church; or that though it was an easy one, it must be right, because it is that of the Church? We must think that M. Maynard has been more resolute in ascribing the Jesuit doctrines to the Church, than successful in disproving that these doctrines were what are usually accounted easy ones.

It is suspicious at starting to find M. Maynard sympathising so strongly with the devotional works criticised by Pascal. He reminds us that the Jesuits had produced something better. But what appeared to Pascal sentimental trifling in the one, and a substitution of childish superstition to S. Mary for real religion in the other, appears to M. Maynard as the very counterpart of modern piety. If he had retorted on Pascal, in return for the cruel immortalizing of the '*Dévotion Aisée*' and the poet of '*Delphine*,' that, after all, that all his wit had been spent on a poor ordinary theological fop of an age of bad taste, a harmless and smirking hanger-on at tea-tables to find them in divinity and wit, it would have been intelligible, if not fair. Not so,

however, M. Maynard; on taste and theology both, he is at issue with Pascal. P. Le Moyne, he thinks, with a little less exuberance of imagination and language, 'might have become a great poet.' He cannot see what he so happily terms, the '*ton musquée et galant*' of Pascal's quotations. The '*Dévotion Aisée*' is *aimable, charmant, délicieux;* its language *ravissant;* its histories like the *doux babil d'un enfant.*[1] When P. Le Moyne said, that by the rules of true devotion, virtue had been made '*plus facile* 'que la vice, et plus aisée que la volupté,' and '*le simple vivre* 'incomparablement plus malaisé que le bien vivre,' he spoke of the joys of a good conscience, and the pains of vice and ambition. When he sneered at melancholy devotees, who thought of nothing but a dreary asceticism, he only meant Port-Royal. We can only say, that it shows that P. Le Moyne and M. Maynard are kindred spirits.

P. Barry's book, '*Le Paradis ouvert à Philagie par cent Dévotions à la Mère de Dieu,*' he gives up, in a literary point of view; but, on the other hand, its spirit, its theology, the devotional practices which it recommends,—some of them, says M. Maynard, of such simplicity, that they make us smile, *esprits forts* that we are, but all authorized by the example of some great saint,—are most edifying. The following shows the principle on which he answers Pascal:—

'Pascal voudrait-il dire que le Père Barry, dans son aveugle confiance, a présenté des pratiques toutes matérielles comme des moyens infaillibles de sanctification, sans qu'il fut nécessaire d'y joindre le *plus petit mouvement* de cœur, *le moindre effort* de la volonté? Il l'insinue méchamment; mais c'est une calomnie. "*Donnez tout le cœur à la Mère d'amour,* dit Barry, avec *protestation qu'aucune créature ne le posséderа.*" Et que fait-il autre chose en tout

[1] 'Le livre de la Dévotion Aisée, du Père Le Moine, est une aimable et charmant petit livre; après les ouvrages de Saint François de Sales, nous n'en connaissons pas de plus delicieux, ni de plus encourageant pour la faiblesse humaine. Aussi ce livre fût-il parfaitement accueilli; et dès son apparition, le goût public lui fit une célébrité. Le Père Le Moine n'était pas seulement un saint religieux, mais un homme d'esprit, et un homme du monde. Il parlait à ceux qu'il voulait amener à la pratique de la dévotion, le seul langage qu'il convint de leur tenir. Ce langage fut entendu, le petit livre fut devoré sans que personne se sentit du poison qu'il contenait; le Jansénisme fut jaloux de ce succès. La facilité de cette dévotion ne consiste pas à lui allier des choses coupables ou dangereuses, mais à montrer qu'elle peut s'unir à toutes les conditions honnêtes de la vie, et qu'elle n'est pas incompatible avec les joies et les plaisirs qu'avoue la vertu . . . *que la religion n'est pas essentiellement cette Thébaïde, ces terreurs, ces desespoirs que rêvait le Jansénisme,* mais que si quelques-uns sont appelés à cette sombre perfection, les autres peuvent le sanctifier dans des conditions communes. Pouvait-on dire autre chose aux gens de monde! et ce langage, n'est-il *pas plus propre à faire des Chrétiens que la morale alambiquée dans St. Cyran?* . . . Pour *nous, nous aimons ce petit livre, et parcequ'il* peut faire du bien à beaucoup d'âmes, et parcequ'il est un véritable curiosité littéraire; nous aimons ces histoires naïves qui ressemblent au doux babil d'un enfant s'entretenant avec son père, et nous ne songeons pas à jeter une pédante critique au-devant de notre admiration. . . Nous plaignions les esprits revêches et farouches de Port-Royal, de *n'avoir pu goûter ce qui nous paraît si charmant et si gracieux.*'—Vol. i. pp. 395—404.

Digitized by Google

son livre, sinon inviter Philagie à consacrer à Marie toutes ses puissances intérieures? Et dans l'endroit même où Pascal est allé chercher *ce petit esclave* si attaché aux créatures, Barry s'écrie: "Donnez-lui votre cœur sans partage, tel qu'il est, et dites-lui ce peu de paroles: 'Suit une consécration à la Ste Vierge, où le cœur est donné sans réserve et avec une effusion charmante.'"'—Vol. i. p. 391.

Undoubtedly Père Barry recommends us to consecrate our whole heart to S. Mary,—in words, it may be observed, than which no other can be imagined to express devotion of ourselves to God; but this is no disproof of Pascal's charge, that in default of this consecration, something as short of it as saluting her image, or pronouncing her name, will avail. Père Binet's little book is, it seems, quite an anticipation of modern ideas and feelings:—

'At the moment when the arduous and overwhelming questions of predestination were agitated in the theological world, the Père Binet thought, with reason, that he would do better to leave on one side all these disputes, in which we may lose faith without ever deriving from them a virtue, in order to point out the practical means of arriving at eternal salvation; and he composed his book, entitled *Marque de Prédestination*, which he dedicated to Cardinal Bellarmine. Among all the means of salvation he chose the devotion to the holy Virgin. *This book seems to have been written for our age, and to contain a sort of prophecy of the wonders which we have seen accomplished in our days by the devotion to Mary.* "When all the world was lost," says Binet, in his first page, "God sent Mary on the earth, and by her He gave us Jesus Christ, the author of all our good. Now that all the world seems rushing to its ruin, nothing can assure us so much as *that the devotion of this worthy Mother of God should begin to flourish again in the Church, and that by her intercession God should be favourable to us, and inflame our hearts again.*" All this, it appears, did not please Port-Royal, which preferred plunging into the abysses of grace and predestination rather *than simply committing itself to the hands of Mary.* Port-Royal did not openly condemn the devotion to the holy Virgin, but as this has something affectionate and tender, which suited not with its doctrines, it preferred a terror, a trembling before God. Consequently, *with reference to certain books which spoke of the worship of the holy Virgin, as we all speak of it, we Christians in* 1851, Port-Royal *set itself to ridicule certain simple practices,* not seeing that impiety would gather up its sarcasms, to turn them against all devotion. Port-Royal it is which has torn from us that simple confidence, that childhood of faith, those sweet tears of prayer, which are to our critical minds and dried-up hearts, but a charming recollection, when they are not an object of ridicule. We have read Père Binet's little book, and without blushing we confess that it has interested us. To prove his thesis, that the devotion to the holy Virgin is a great mark of predestination, he goes through all the figures of the Bible, all the passages of sacred literature and of the Fathers, where there is allusion to the greatness, powers, and the mercies of Mary. He develops especially that thought, familiar to S. Bernard, that God has given us everything by her, and that this order is henceforth unchangeable; that she is our advocate and our patroness, and that her true servants cannot perish.'—Vol. i. pp. 391—393.

Whether there are not differences between what is childlike and what is childish in religion; whether it matters or not *how,* and *on what object,* the religious affections are exercised, so that

they *are* exercised; whether it be right or not to encourage religious practices and belief by what is apocryphal, must still remain questions while the divisions of Christendom remain. But it can be no question whether what Pascal, as a Roman Catholic, repudiates as a degrading self-deceit, M. Maynard, as a Roman Catholic, accepts both as beautiful in spirit, and as the acknowledged devotional idea of his own time.

From worship and devotion, let us go to practice. The following is an incidental sketch, by one who had good means of observing, of the religion of the day in the time of Louis XIV. It seems to be the echo of Pascal's interpretation of the '*Dévotion Aisée,*' and the '*Paradis Ouvert,*' as opening to the world, '*des moyens d'assurer son salut, assez faciles, assez sûr, et en assez grand nombre.*'

'J'ai appris avec beaucoup de plaisir que M. le Comte de Gramont a recouvré sa première santé, et acquis une devótion nouvelle. Jusqu'ici, je me suis contenté grossièrement d'être homme de bien; il faut faire quelque chose de plus; et je n'attends que votre exemple pour être dévot. *Vous vivez dans un pays où l'on a de merveilleux avantages pour se sauver. Le vice n'y est guère moins opposé à la mode qu'à la vertu. Pécher, c'est ne savoir pas vivre, et choquer la bienséance autant que la religion.* Ceux qui n'ont pas assez de considération pour l'autre vie sont conduits au salut par les égards et les devoirs de celle-ci. C'en est assez sur une matière où la conversion de M. de Gramont en a engagé: je la crois sincère et honnête. Il sied bien à un homme qui n'est pas jeune d'oublier qu'il l'a été.'

The passage is from a letter to the notorious Ninon de l'Enclos, from S. Evremond, the old favourite of Ninon and of Marion Delorme, the master of gay and easy philosophy in the court of Charles II., and of whom, in proof, we must observe, of his religion, his biographer[1] writes, that 'though very worldly in 'his morality, he had always held it as a principle to respect 'religion, and made outward profession of the Catholic faith. 'He would never allow it to be turned into a matter of plea-'santry.'[2]

Whatever doubt there may be as to the meaning of making

[1] Biog. Univ.—'*S. Evremond.*'

[2] 'La seule bienséance,' he said, 'et le respect qu'on doit à ses concitoyens, ne le permettait pas.' The writer quotes the passage we have given, as a proof of his religion, and proceeds to add, that if we could have any doubts 'on the subject of his religion, his will would dispel them, in which he "implores the mercy of God," and leaves a pious legacy for poor Catholics;' and then cites the following verses of S. Evremond on himself:—

'De justice et de charité,
Beaucoup plus que de pénitence,
Il compose sa piété.

'Mettant en Dieu sa confiance,
Espérant tout de sa bonté,
Dans le sein de la Providence
Il trouve son repos et sa félicité.'

Digitized by Google

'la dévotion plus facile que le vice, et plus aisée que la volupté,' in the mouth of a priest, there can be little—whether it be irony or earnest—about its meaning in the mouth of a wit. Yet when M. Maynard wants to convey what he considers a just and true view of religious strictness, in contrast to the rigour and Puritanism of Port-Royal, he goes to seek it in a dialogue between S. Evremond and one of his friends:—

'Elles font,'—says D'Aubigny to S. Evremond, in the conversation between them in St. Evremond's works, speaking of the doctrines of Port-Royal,—'Elles font une violence éternelle à la nature; elles ôtent de la religion ce qui nous console; elles y mettent la crainte, la douleur, le désespoir. Les Jansénistes, voulant faire des saints de tous les hommes, n'en trouvent pas dix dans un royaume, pour faire des Chrétiens tels qu'ils les veulent. Le Christianisme est divin, mais ce sont des hommes qui le reçoivent; et quoi qu'on fasse, il faut s'accommoder à l'humanité. Une philosophie trop austère fait peu de sage; une politique trop rigoureuse peu de bons sujets; une religion trop dure, peu d'âmes religieuses qui le soient long temps. Rien n'est durable, qui ne s'accommode à la nature. La grâce dont nous parlons tant, s'y accommode elle-même; Dieu se sert de la docilité de notre esprit, et de la tendresse de notre cœur, pour se faire reçevoir et se faire aimer. Il est certain que les docteurs trop rigides donnent plus d'aversion pour eux que pour les péchés. La pénitence qu'ils prêchent fait préférer la facilité qu'il y a de demeurer dans le vice, aux difficultés qu'il y a d'en sortir.'—Vol. i. p. 202.

Here is a man of the world's view of religion, and the wisdom of this world speaks in it. It was, no doubt, the view of the Court of Louis XIV. M. Maynard offers it as the view of the Church. It is a strange way of expressing the indulgence and condescension of religion. This, says M. Maynard, the Jansenists ignored; and we believe that it is partly true. But if the Jansenists, in reviving the old ideas about penitence, forgot that the Gospel had an indulgent side, those whom they opposed seem to have forgotten that it has a stern one; and what is more, M. Maynard, at this day, in his defence of them, forgets it too. If the Jansenists spoke to all the world the same language, and bound weak as well as strong to counsels of perfection, most assuredly the Casuists spoke as if the mass of Christians were dispensed from all but the veriest shadows of religion, and as if it were necessary to the success of religion that the 'gate' should be declared to be *not* 'strait,' and the 'way' not 'narrow.' And the theologian of the nineteenth century tells us that they were right.

Let us take first M. Maynard's view of perhaps the most prominent feature of the Roman practical system—their system of penitence.

The great feature of the Port-Royalist directors was, that penitence to be effectual must be real and searching; and that the sacraments without this effectual penitence availed nothing.

Here M. Maynard sees the root of their error. In opposition to it he thus states the Jesuit principle:—

'Understanding a little better the redemption of love, the admirable economy of the Sacraments, those sacred channels which place us in communication with the source of divine graces, *the Jesuits urged men to the participation of the divine mysteries, with the same ardour as the Jansenists displayed in turning them away.* They were convinced with the Church, that nowhere else was there succour for the weakness, or medicine for the wounds of the soul. Jansenism *abandoned man to his own resources,* while it looked on his faculties as annihilated by sin. The Jesuits, more consistent, bade him walk with God, and borrow continually from the treasures prepared by God's mercy, the supply needed by his own powers, weakened indeed, but not destroyed. Men, gifted at once with a practical sense of life, and with a boundless charity, on the one hand *they dreamed not of a chimerical perfection, and thought not of transforming the world into a Thebaid, and driving all Christians into the desert:* and on the other, they repelled no one, offering themselves to heal the deepest wounds of the soul, as well as its ailings and its weaknesses, making themselves "all things to all men," like S. Paul, and feeling themselves obliged to continue the ministry of the Master, who came not to call the righteous, but sinners.'

'Persuaded that the sinner, if no one holds out a hand, will plunge deeper and deeper into vice, and fall soon into an irrecoverable impenitence, they were eager to snatch him from evil, *to interrupt, at least, his sinful habits, to give him, by some act of virtue, a taste of the virtue which he knows not. They did not demand, for admission to reconciliation, those interior dispositions,* which even the most perfect do not always attain, and which, consequently, are to him well nigh impossible, in his state of sin and disfavour with God; *but only that he should actually place no obstacle in the way of the effect of the Sacrament, whatever might be his future miserable falls,* (quelles que dussent être ses misères futures;) *and they left to grace the care of fortifying his weakness, of rendering his backslidings, at first less frequent, then rare, till he should arrive in due time at a perfect conversion, and the sinner become a saint.*'

'It was possible to abuse this charitable tolerance; who doubts it? Men might sometimes find in the facility of pardon an encouragement to vice; who denies it? But the evil was the exception in this system of direction, while it was the good which was the exception in that of the Jansenists. *For one sinner who changed the divine remedy into poison, a thousand found in it recovery and life; for one sinner who would consent to follow the long and painful way opened by Jansenism to reconciliation, a thousand refused to take the first step, and excusing themselves on the ground of the impossibility of virtue, fixed their permanent abode in vice, or fell into despair.*'

'It is not necessary *to be a theologian, nor even a Christian,* to understand that: it is enough to be a man, and therefore, we leave with confidence *to men of the world* who may read us, the business of pronouncing between Jansenius and Loyola.'

The appeal to men of the world on a question of strictness of direction is curious. But we would not have M. Maynard too sure of their verdict. They admire strictness, in theory, at least; and they might, moreover, be apt to think that, if confession and penance cannot be worked on a large scale strictly and really, without driving the masses from the altar, or to hang themselves, they may be dispensed with on a large scale altogether. And what, in fact, was the case in that seventeenth

Digitized by Google

century, when the 'Jesuits had *the monopoly of direction*, which they held exclusively of the public confidence?'[1] M. Maynard asks, indeed, '*Does any one believe that morals were 'more relaxed at the time when Probabilism was the doctrine 'of nearly all the schools, than in our own*, when we hypo- 'critically protest against it?'[2]—'Quant aux hommes de bien, 'qu'importe un système spéculatif? . . . Nous *concluons donc 'hardiment* que ces systèmes de morale, dont on peut éternelle- 'ment disputer, n'ont aucune influence sérieuse sur la conduite 'de la vie.' But it is he who tells us this was such an epoch of licentiousness and impiety, that it is a fair argument against the reality of the feeling raised by Pascal on the subject of the bad maxims, 'that there was not sufficient moral sense left to be really revolted by them.'[3] If the fact were not notorious, we should learn even from him of the steady progress of irreligion throughout the seventeenth century—of Père Mersenne's[4] calculation of the number of atheists in 1623,—60,000 in France, 50,000 in Paris, 12 in a single house; of the 'hypocritical reserves which the severe and morose piety of' the great pupil of the Jesuits, 'Louis XIV., as he grew old, imposed on profligacy;' and how to these 'hypocritical reserves,' and this 'severe and morose piety,' succeeded the days of the Regent Orleans and Louis XV.—days of blasphemy and abomination, probably never equalled since the world was made. We must add, however, that he lays this to the account of the Provincial Letters!

Such is the broad principle on which the Jesuit system of direction is defended. To make penitence a work which may alarm the half-hearted, is not only sneered at as '*transforming the world into a Thebaid*,' but plainly stated to be an intentional blow at religion; and to urge on men in general the *moral* discipline of religion, is to deny the grace, and abolish the use of the Sacraments—to 'abandon man to his own resources.' Indeed, as to what was, *in fact*, the Jesuit principle, there is little difference between Pascal and M. Maynard.[5]

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 34. [2] Vol. i. p. 200. [3] Vol. i. p. 203. [4] Vol. i. p. 61.

[5] 'Take away,' he says, 'from the following statement, the exaggeration, the tone of irony, the spiteful insinuations, and you will have in fact the principle of the Jesuits in the conduct of souls,'—the principle which he tells us is the principle of the Church. 'Alas!' says the *bon père*, in the Sixth Provinciale,—'alas! it would have been our first object to establish no maxims but those of the Gospel in all their strictness: and it may be seen sufficiently by the regularity of our own morals, that if we suffer some laxity in others, it is rather by condescension than by design. We are forced to it. Men are now so corrupt, that since we cannot make them come to us, we must go to them; otherwise they would leave us: they would do worse, they would give themselves up altogether. And it is to keep hold on them that our Casuists have taken into consideration the vices to which men

Accordingly the Jesuits' great boast was that they had made confession popular by their system. They had won back to the Roman Church that *prestige* of popular religion which for a time the Reformation had claimed. 'We are overwhelmed,' they say in the *Imago Primi Sæculi,—obruimur,—* 'by the number of penitents.' With a confidence only equalled by Luther's *Pecca fortiter,* and equally likely to be misunderstood, they protest that —singular change in this sinful world of ours!—men had become more eager to confess than to commit sin, '*Alacrius multo atque ardentius scelera jam expiantur quam ante solebant committi.*' Nothing was more common, '*nil magis moribus receptum,*' than monthly or weekly confession. Many '*no sooner contract a stain than they wash it out.*' Here is an account, indeed, of a popular religion, which M. Maynard does not except to—'*les jeunes Jésuites vantent avec raison,*'—though he charges Pascal, as usual, with '*falsifying*' it, not because he misquotes it, but because he supplies the reason of it.

But how was this brought about? What was that '*pietatis sollertia,*' that '*religiosa calliditas,*' of which the Jesuits boasted? '*Pieuses et saintes finesses,*' '*artifices de dévotion,*' '*adoucissements de confession;*'—these are Pascal's interpretations. 'Admirables paroles!' on the contrary, says M. Maynard, 'qui n'expriment pas d'autres subtilités, ou d'autres finesses 'que celles de Jésus-Christ même.' What Pascal denounces, as irreligious, M. Maynard accepts as necessary and Catholic. Thus the Jesuit authorities cited by Pascal seem only intent on removing every obstacle to the facility of absolution. M. Maynard quarrels with Pascal's use of the passages; he says, what is true, that Filiuci and his brethren say something besides this; but still, that they do say this, he allows, and justifies it. A man, he says, kneels down, confesses with shame his faults; says that he is sorry for them; that he has a firm resolution of not committing them again; on the other hand, he is not in any '*occasion prochaine,*' and *nothing proves that he has any affection for sin.* Why not believe him, and absolve him? *You have believed his confession, why not believe his promises.* '*Disons enfin, que dans la pratique* '*on est souvent obligé d'en agir ainsi. Pascal pouvait l'ignorer;* '*mais les prêtres d'expérience, les missionnaires surtout, le savent* '*bien.*' (ii. 19.) So, again, Suarez and Filiuci are quoted as saying:—

---

are most inclined in all conditions of life, in order to establish maxims so mild, without at the same time doing violence to truth, that persons must be hard to please if they are not satisfied with them; for the leading design which our Society has in view for the good of religion, is not to repel any one, whoever he may be, in order not to drive the world to despair.'

Digitized by Google

'That "the priest is obliged to believe his penitent on his word," and, "that it is not necessary that the confessor should persuade himself that the resolution of his penitent will be fulfilled, nor that he himself judge that it probably will; but it is enough that he think that he has at the moment the intention in general, though he may relapse in a very short time." And it is thus that all our authors teach: *Ita docent omnes autores.*'

On which the comment is:—

'It is, alas! but too certain that the confessor must often act thus, under the alternative of reconciling sinners but rarely, and leaving them to besot themselves in their vicious habits. But, by the grace of absolution (which is supposed to be always given, in cases of sufficient disposition), relapses will soon become less frequent, and the conversion finish by being complete.'

Even the startling sentiment, that 'absolution may be given 'to him who avows that the hope of being absolved had led 'him to sin with more ease than if he had not had the hope,' is thus explained:—

'*Encore Bauny! que c'est ennuyeux!* These quotations are made up of passages taken from right and left, at the interval of several folio columns. *N'importe, c'est à peu près cela.* Only Bauny adds: So that the penitent, affected with necessary sorrow, brings to confession the plan of living better: "ce qui ne veut pas dire pourtant, nous l'avouons, qu'il ne soit un peu relâché." But it is not less true, that absolution frequently repeated, will often be the only mode of rescuing a sinner from vicious habits. *The friends of God* are much stronger than his foes against their passions. The return to grace is itself a first victory, which will soon lead to a decisive triumph. There may be exceptions to this rule, this is unquestionable; but all must be left to the prudence of the confessor.'—Vol. ii. pp. 22, 23.

A curious light, this, thrown incidentally on the actual working of one of the seemingly strictest parts of the Roman system. We shall understand this better, when we examine M. Maynard's way of dealing with the subject of contrition and the love of God. Pascal quotes from P. Pinthereau the sentiment that 'all the Jesuit fathers teach, with one consent, that it 'is an error, and almost a heresy, to say that contrition is neces-'sary, and that attrition alone, even conceived by the mere 'dread of the pains of hell, but excluding the will to sin, is not 'sufficient with the sacrament' of absolution. The pithy comment on this is, 'C'est vrai.' 'What, almost an article of faith!' cries Pascal; 'every one else has required at least some love of God to be mixed with this "attrition."' 'P. Pinthereau,' says the comment, '*does not deny it;* but still this will be short of contrition.'[1]

What is *contrition*, then, that a Christian may do without it and be justified? What degree of sanctity is it that makes it *more than necessary* for men in general? It is sorrow for sin,

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 27, 28.

Digitized by Google

which is distinguished from the lower form of *attrition*, by proceeding from, and being joined with, a true and hearty love of God. This true and hearty love of God may vary in degree; but where it exists in any real sense, there is contrition.[1] Attrition is the sorrow which springs from the fear of punishment, a disgust at sin, and though mixed with an 'inchoate love,' it is distinctly said to want real *charity*, or love of God. And the approved Roman doctrine is, we are informed, that a man whose sole motive for being sorry for his sins is the fear of their punishment, and who has nothing but the *motion* to love God, but no true love of Him, *requires* no other frame of mind to fit him for pardon, but is, when he receives the sacrament of Absolution, actually and truly forgiven and justified. The doctrine is, not that he is in *the way*, or may *hope* to be forgiven—it is, that he *is* forgiven; justification is given him, not in promise or foretaste, but in actual possession.

'It is certain that attrition suffices with the Sacrament for the justification of the sinner. Theologians were still disputing on this point at the end of the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent not having decided anything. But the Jansenist doctrine on the *necessity* of contrition justifying by itself, drew afresh the attention of theologians to this important question; and at this day, *it would be almost a heresy*, as P. Pinthereau said, to maintain the insufficiency of attrition, even arising from the sole motive of the pains of hell, provided that it be accompanied by a beginning of love of God, considered as the source of all justice.'—Vol. ii. p. 29.

The reason assigned for this doctrine is a remarkable one. It is, according to Liguori, that contrition, *loving* sorrow, justifies of itself, *without* and *before* the sacrament of Absolution;[2]

---

[1] *Contrition* is defined by the Council of Trent, as '*Animi dolor ac detestatio de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi de cætero*,' and stated to be a necessary part of the sacrament of Penance. But the later theologians, *e. g.* Liguori, hold that the word is a *generic* one, and comprehends, 1. *Perfect contrition*, which arises '*ex motivo charitatis*.' 2. *Imperfect contrition*, which is called *attrition*, 'which is conceived either from a view of the foulness of sin, or the fear of hell, excluding the will to sin, and including the hope of pardon;' but having only '*amor inchoatus*,' which is different in kind, not only in degree, from the *true love of God*, '*charitas prædominans*,' which, whether more or less intensely, loves God above the creature. 'Nos non negamus requiri in attritione initium amoris, sed dicimus tantum non requiri charitatem prædominantem.'—*Liguori, Hom. Apost.* Tr. xvi. c. 2. No. 8, 14.

[2] 'Sacramenta actualiter operantur quod significant; unde verificari debet (ex se loquendo) quod cum sacerdos dat absolutionem, eo momento peccata remittuntur... Si ergo in dolore necessario requiritur charitas prædominans, sacramentum nunquam causaret gratiam, quia omnes accederent jam justificati; nam quilibet dolor qui ex charitate prædominante procedit est vera contritio, ut docet S. Thomas; et hoc accidit quoties homini displicet potius gratiæ quam alterius boni amissio; et cum illa sit vera contritio, quamvis exiguus sit dolor, delet peccata.'... '*Omnem culpam delet*,' says S. Thomas; and again, '*Per solam contritionem dimittitur peccatum*,... *si antequam absolvitur habeat hoc sacramentum in voto, jam virtus clavium operatur in ipso*.' The love of God spoken of in Scripture cannot, in its lowest degree, be joined with sin; and in its lowest degree is different from that '"beginning of it" which may be with attrition.' 'Si autem in attritione desidera

and that, therefore, as the sacrament does also of itself justify, it must require, as a previous disposition, *something less* than is sufficient to justify independently of it. If contrition, which implies charity, were necessary, the sacrament would never cause grace, or justify; for the simple reason, that those who came fitly to it, would come already justified. Contrition, he says, is a 'formal act of charity,' which loves God above all things, and which, therefore, according to innumerable passages of Scripture, cannot be joined with sin; 'since, therefore, it is 'certain that the love which loves God above all things, whatever 'it be in degree, (*charitatem prædominantem quamvis remissam,*) 'cannot be joined with sin, it is certain that any sort of con-'trition, being formally an act of charity, takes away sins.' There would, therefore, be no room left for the proper and real office of the sacrament in justifying, if we suppose that it required a disposition of such intrinsic efficacy as contrition. And M. Maynard does not shrink from the Jesuit's startling conclusion, quoted by Pascal as the *ne plus ultra* of nonsense and laxity joined. 'Que la contrition n'est point du tout néces-'saire pour obtenir l'effet principal du Sacrement (*i.e.* justifica-'tion), mais au contraire, *elle y est plutôt un obstacle: "imo 'obstat potius quominus effectus sequatur."*'[1]

The doctrine, too, is a curious case of a doctrine developing from a vagueness which gave an advantage to the stricter interpretation, to a clearness which took it away. The process, as given in Liguori, may be compared with Pascal's account of the growth of probable opinions.[2] A General Council left things in doubt; a Pope, while forbidding either side to censure or insult the other, dropped the admission that the opinion of one was the common opinion of the schools. A moral theologian whom the Church has canonized drew the inference, that since the Pope

retur *amor inchoatus*, qui sit *principium* amoris . . . hoc non negatur, et dicimus hoc initium jam in qualibet attritione reperiri, tum metu pœnarum a Deo infligendarem, ("*Timor dei initium dilectionis,*") tum spe remissionis et beatitudinis.' But a 'verus charitatis prædominantis actus' is not necessary. Of course, even with contrition, the 'will to fulfil all righteousness,' involves the desire of the sacrament.—*Liguori, Hom. Ap.* Tr. xvi. c. 2. No. 16.

[1] To which the comment is, 'C'est très vrai, puisqu'alors le pécheur est déjà justifié, que le Sacrement n'a plus rien à faire sous ce rapport principal, et qu'il ne peut en augmenter la grâce sanctifiante.' Accordingly, he charges the Jansenists with 'destroying the use' of the Sacrament, for saying that the *absolution of the priest is real, only when it follows the sentence of the invisible Judge,* and requiring in consequence great preparation; '*Nous y voilà,*' says he, when Pascal charges the Jesuits with giving absolution indifferently to all who ask for it, without first considering whether Jesus Christ unlooses in heaven those whom they unloose on earth; '*Nous y voilà; Jésus-Christ doit d'abord délier dans le ciel avant que le prêtre ne délie sur la terre.*' Here is the secret let out of the Jansenist plan. 'In such a case the priest's office was useless, for the sinner was already purified before God.'—Vol. ii. pp. 3—17.

[2] Prov. VI. 'D'abord, le docteur *grave* qui l'a inventée l'expose au monde,' &c.

Digitized by Google

had attested that this *was* the common opinion of the schools, it had become the *morally certain* one, and therefore the opposite the *improbable* one, which no doctor may embrace. 'The Pope's 'decree,' he remarks, 'does not forbid the opposite opinion to 'be called *improbable*; for improbability is not a note of cen- 'sure or contumely forbidden by the decree.' And, at last, the public is informed by dignified ecclesiastics, as a matter of notoriety, that it has become 'presque une hérésie' to hold it.[1]

Nor is this a mere question of the schools. So practical a question is it, that M. Maynard, with Père Pinthereau, can see no mercy or advantage in the Gospel, if contrition is made identical with saving penitence, and sinners are to be told that justification cannot be had without it:—

'C'est le couronnement de cette doctrine,' says the *bon père*. 'Vous y verrez donc que cette dispense de l'obligation *fâcheuse* d'aimer Dieu est le privilège de la loi évangélique par-dessus la judaïque. "Il a été raisonnable, dit-il, que, dans la loi de grâce du N. T., Dieu levât l'obligation fâcheuse et difficile, qui était dans la loi de rigueur, d'exercer un acte de parfaite contrition pour être justifié: et qu'il instituât des sacrements qui pussent suppléer son défaut, à l'aide d'une disposition plus facile. Autrement, certes, les enfants (les Chrétiens) n'auraient pas maintenant plus de facilité de se remettre aux bonnes grâces de leur Père, qu'avaient jadis ces esclaves (les Juifs), d'obtenir miséricorde de leur Seigneur." '—Lett. X.

M. Maynard corrects Pascal, and corrects him as follows:—

'It is not the obligation of loving God that Father Pinthereau treats as "painful," (*fâcheuse,*) but the necessity of a perfect contrition in order to be justified. And it is certain that this act [we have seen how Liguori defines it] is so sublime, so difficult to degraded man, plunged in sensuality, that the sinner would have reason to tremble if he had no other means of reconciliation. Yes, the divine economy of the sacraments is one of the most admirable parts of the New Law, one of its great excellences, compared with the law of severity and fear. The sinner, who could never

[1] 'Sed sententia satis communis, quam nos sequimur, tenet sufficere attritionem sine charitate prædominante, quæ oritur ex timore inferni, aut gloriæ amissione, aut ex horrore erga peccati turpitudinem, lumine fidei cognitam: ita tenent Gonet, Canus, Petroc., Tourn., Cabass., Wigandt, Abelly, Navarr., Suar., Tolet., Lugo, Laym., Salmer. et alii multi, cum Bened. XIV. qui asserit quod *post Trid.* cum plausu hanc sententiam omnes scholæ sibi adoptarunt; unde recte dicunt Suar. Less., Castr., Filliuc., Carden., Rainaud., Lugo, Prado, Tanner., Viva et Croix, hanc sententiam *hodie post concil. esse moraliter certam, et oppositam non esse amplius probabilem.* Et quod scholæ, saltem communius, tanquam moraliter certam habeant, constat ex decr. Alex. VII. (5 Maii, 1667,) ubi sub excommunicatione prohibuit, "ne quis audeat alicujus theologicæ censuræ alteriusque injuriæ aut contumeliæ notâ taxare alterutram sententiam, *sive negantem necessitatem aliqualis dilectionis Dei in attritione ex metu gehennæ conceptâ,* quæ hodie inter scholasticos communis videtur, sive asserentem dictæ dilectionis necessitatem." Attestando ergo Pontifex sententiam negantem esse communiorem inter scholasticos, consequenter testatur in scholis haberi communiter certam; dum quisque scit, *quod circa sacramentorum valorem alias sententias quam moraliter certas, non posse doctores amplecti.* Nec præfato decr. vetuit Pontifex, sententiam oppositam posse nuncupari *improbabilem;* nam improbabilitas non est nota censuræ aut contumeliæ per decretum vetita;' especially as we do not deny the necessity of an '*initium amoris.*'—*Liguori, Hom. Ap.* Tr. xvi. c. 2. No. 14.

Digitized by Google

assure himself on the worth of his personal acts, raises himself in perfect security, at this word of the priest, "Go in peace, thy sins are forgiven thee."'—Vol. ii. p. 41.

The last part of the letter on the love of God, reads as if it were a caricature. It seems as if, to show the radically false principle of the popular casuistry, Pascal said, Apply the plan of weighing and measuring moral obligation, of fixing the minimum which is safe for conscience, and with which absosolution may be granted, of construing rules relating to conscience by the maxim of law, that penal enactments must be interpreted strictly—'*odiosa sunt restringenda et rigorose applicanda*'—of finding out what is the *least* amount of morality and religion which is compatible with a state of grace and assurance of justification—apply this to *the* '*great* commandment,' the obligation to love God 'with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.' If you are consistent, you are bound to find a minimum here; you are bound to answer the question,—What is enough to satisfy the obligation which the gospel makes indispensable? On your system, men will come to you, as directors of conscience, as those who translate into practical and feasible reality the general principles of duty, as confessors who can refuse absolution if the measure of duty has not been fulfilled, and ask you, What are we bound to? not in a vague indefinite way, but in detail and fact; and you must be able to tell them with certainty or probability, so as to assure their conscience: and the weak will come as well as the strong. On your pretension, of undertaking to entertain and satisfy all questions definitely, as to how much of obedience is necessary and safe, you must be prepared for questions, as to how often, and when, God is to be loved by Christians who wish for justification and salvation. You must not be content, as preachers, with general exhortations to love to the uttermost; you must, as practical moralists, gravely weigh, discuss, limit, and define—define, too, with practical certainty, for it is a matter for practice, and the love of God is one which concerns consciences very seriously,—what is the least that a man may be allowed to love God. And then Pascal might be imagined going on, with the exaggeration of a *reductio ad absurdum*, to represent the great lights of casuistry, meeting and determining exactly what God intended when He bade men love Him with all their heart—some opining for more, some for less, but all *fixing* the measure, and all, whether they fixed it at once in *three* or once in *five* years, allowing to their colleagues' opinion the benefit of probability, however confident they might be of their own; all forced by a supposed consistency to treat the most transcendent law of religious affection in the fashion of bidders at a Dutch auction.

But it is no caricature. The authorities and decisions which he quotes are real ones. The Casuists *have* found it necessary to settle, whether God *must* be loved once, or three times, or eight times in a Christian's life; Escobar gravely pronounces in favour of the moderate Henriquez, who strikes the mean between the excess of Azor, who is for *eight* times, and the defect of Sanchez, who is for *one*, and prescribes, himself, *three*—the age of discretion, the hour of death, and once every five years. It is necessary to distinguish between cases where the obligation to love God is essential, and where accidental. Vasquez and Suarez have really pondered seriously over the problem of *how often;* Castro Palao had as really 'combated them, and with reason, *merito;*' and it is not Pascal but a real Jesuit who represents the most distinguished theologians so puzzled by this question, of how often is *the love of God obligatory;* and so discordant is their solution *when*, that he despairingly takes refuge in the answer,—*Never.*

But if not a caricature, it must, then, of course, we might suppose, be wrong—say, an exploded extravagance, chargeable on the age, or on a perverse love of system, but which it would be unjust to impute to modern theologians. We might the more be led to think this, from finding very similar propositions condemned by Alexander VII. and Innocent XI. And from finding them thus censured, we might have inferred that the Popes meant to discountenance this fashion, whether scientific or practical, of beating down, under the show of *fixing*, the *obligation* of the love of God, as 'at least scandalous.' But we should only have shown our haste and our ignorance of the effect of a censure. M. Maynard, who addresses his refutation of Pascal to the intelligence of the day, is not a whit behind Escobar or Bauny, or the *bon père* himself, in maintaining the good sense and necessity and practical ends of limiting the *obligation* to love God. It is a natural problem in theological science, and necessary information for confessors and their penitents. The Popes have, indeed, condemned *some* ways of limiting it; but it is a mistake to suppose that that has anything to do with *other* ways. The effect of the censure is not to condemn the method of inquiry, but definite wrong answers. From it results the measure up to which, according to the Church, we are bound to exercise love to God. But this measure is a vague one; and though the more definite answers condemned are wrong, other equally definite ones may be right. To the honour of the Jesuits be it said, that *since* the censure, at least, they have never maintained any of *these* propositions. But the *commandment* to love God must be treated like any other precept or obligation—as we treat a civil law, enjoining

Digitized by Google

or forbidding; it must be construed strictly and against itself; whatever it does not specify, we are not bound to. And here, except within the very wide limits fixed by the Church, we are not bound to any *time*. Obligatory it is, we know; but *when*, and how often, is an open question among theologians; and it is easier to say when it is not, than when it is.

'In the "great commandment" there is the *negative* and *general* precept, which obliges us, under all circumstances, to do nothing against the love of God, and to observe his law; but there is besides, the *affirmative* and *special* one, which obliges us to formal acts of charity. The *affirmative* precept obliges, first *accidentally*, when there is no other way of returning to favour with God, and of itself also, not *always*, but *from time to time* in the course of life.

'It is on the precept of the love of God in this latter view of it, that theologians dispute.

'Now, there are but few points decided about it by the Church. It results, on the one hand, from the censure of certain propositions, that there is obligation to a formal act of love of God, when we have attained the age of reason, (taking this instant in a certain moral latitude,) at the point of death, and several times during life, so that there should not be between each act an interval of five years, nor a culpable delay; and, on the other hand, that this obligation does not exist, as Baius and Jansenius hold, in all the moments and circumstances of life: all the rest is controverted, and will ever be, among theologians. It is especially impossible to assign, besides the two extreme limits of life, the precise and certain moment when the precept obliges.'—Vol. ii. pp. 6, 7, *quoting Bossuet.*

And therefore all these Jesuits attacked by Pascal are so far from being wrong or even extravagant, that they say nothing but what is perfectly conformable to Catholic truth and wisdom. 'One only,' le père Antoine Sirmond, who is so puzzled to find when it is ever *necessary* to love God, 'may be abandoned to the passionate justice of Pascal;' and even he, well-meaning man, is more sinned against than sinning. Escobar, too, the 'good old Escobar,' who never dreamt of falling into the hands of a Pascal, and was therefore incautious, vexes M. Maynard with his occasional careless slips; but the rest are blameless.

'Suarez is admirable for his wisdom on this point. After having said that the precept of the love of God obliges "*accidentally*," *when a man cannot recur to the sacrament, and has no other means of justification*, and, besides, at the point of death, he adds, "that it also obliges sometimes, *of itself*, like every precept; and besides, the love of God is necessary to salvation, only it is difficult to determine the time of the obligation. But the love of God may not be delayed long after the first use of reason; further, it ought to be reiterated sometimes (*quelquefois*) during life; for it is evident that it is not enough for a man to love once or twice in the course of his existence the God for whom he was created, and who is the last end of his actions. But what ought to be this time? It is for prudence to determine it." Vasquez says nothing more than Escobar attributes to him; but he is speaking only of the precept of contrition. Now the two precepts of love of God and contrition being *certainly* connected together only at the hour of death, Vasquez could not determine any other time. Castro Palao does

indeed combat all these opinions; but we must understand him. He also distinguishes the obligation *per se* and *per accidens*. By violating this last, we sin, not against charity, but some other virtue. "*Pure question de mots qui ne change rien à la pratique.*" For the obligation *per se*, it presses from time to time during life, and it is not right to delay long the accomplishment; and, always submitting himself to the judgment of the prudent, he would regard as grave an omission of three years. He thus ends:—"*It is rare that a Christian, except he be of depraved morals, makes himself guilty of this crime;* for often he endeavours to dispose himself by contrition for the sacrament of Penitence; often he meditates on the benefit of God and his sovereign bounty, the consideration of which incites in him sentiments of charity." *Remarkable words, which shew well how all these disputes were purely speculative.*'—Vol. ii. pp. 35, 36.

The question, then, is worthy of pious Christians, solemn and laborious theologians, anxious penitents, and practical men. Up to a certain point, the illumination of the Church clears up our doubts as to how often in our lives we *must* love God; but even with the light of these decisions much remains vague. Of course it is a good thing to do so as often as we can. M. Maynard bids us remark that all the Jesuists say so, and that they wrote excellent practical books on the subject; but theologians and confessors require to know not only *when we ought*, but *when we must*. And within the limits fixed for the obligation by the Church, it is a charitable and profitable work to thin out as much as possible the *obligation* of specific occasion, because an *obligation* of the Church involves a definite mortal sin, if neglected. 'The Jesuits,' as M. Maynard remarks, though they, as a general rule, teach all the points decided by the Church, '*refute very well* those authors, *who, on vain reasons*, '*pretend that the* precept of charity *obliges of itself* on all 'festival days; when an adult receives baptism—going to 'martyrdom—at the beginning of some difficult and excellent 'work—on occasion of signal benefit of God—in temptations to 'hate him—at the reception of the Eucharist—after a mortal 'sin, in case that a man cannot or will not have recourse to the 'sacrament of penitence.'[1] On these occasions it is purely a question of simple probability, whether we are *bound* to love God; some Jesuits, he observes, say we *are*, on some of them; but as the Church has decided nothing on the subject, we cannot get certainty. Therefore to sift these *pros* and *cons* is an employment worthy to occupy their thoughts, their ingenuity, and their time; and they have come for the most part to admirable conclusions.

Such is M. Maynard's *mentiris impudentissime* to Pascal; and having upset his theology, he answers him as an orator and a man. Pascal is a 'calumniator,' a 'sophist,' a dealer in

[1] Vol. ii. p 7.

Digitized by Google

'false eloquence,' for contrasting this system with the language of Scripture. 'The theologians,' says his refuter, 'have never 'dispensed with the love of God, and *have spoken only of the 'time when the rigorous obligation of the precept pressed: voilà 'la calomnie.* The sophistry consists in supposing that the love of 'God is a thing which may be decreed, and which depends on the 'theories, more or less subtle, of the schools. *Mais qu'y font 'ces théories?* Will men love God more or less, according as 'this or that decision is found in the *folio* pages of theologians? '*L'amour de Dieu,*' he continues, '*s'inspire, et ne se decrète pas.*' Doubtless, 'decrees' about affections are strange things: who would think of 'decreeing' how many times a-year a son was to love his father, or inquiring how often the obligation of loving her husband was not binding on his wife. But, then, for what purpose were these decisions? Who did make decrees about the great commandment? Or does M. Maynard think that Pascal complains because theologians had decided on once in five years instead of once a-week? '*Theories of the Schools*'—'*pages in folio of theologians,*'—is it M. Maynard who speaks so slightingly of labours which he has just presented as so practically necessary and so admirably executed? Is it he who compares the natural instincts of good sense and good feeling with the weighty maxims of Suarez and Vasquez, and takes refuge from books in the heart? '*L'amour de Dieu ne se 'decrète pas.*' We cannot set it up in men's hearts by theories and decisions. True, M. Maynard, but may it not be explained away by them?

Now, these belong to a class of subjects in respect to which the Roman Church has been set before us of late in an imposing aspect; subjects in themselves of permanent interest — the principles and tone of clerical teaching, the depth and seriousness and practical reach of theological doctrines translated into systems at work among men—the discipline of Christian life, amid the passions, the confusions, or the opportunities of the world. In all these matters, great, as we very well know, is the boast of the Roman Catholic Church. She, we have been told, has the most refined and severe principles. She has had living examples of them. She, we are told continually, is uncompromising, consistent, uniform, and she only. This is her boast, and, so far as it is true, her strength. By it her defenders override, with no measured triumph, the theological or historical difficulties of her case. All other bodies, they say, are loose, have no principles, or are afraid of them; are tame in their moral spirit, compromisers with evil, shrinking from the realities of faith, systematic smoothers of the rough ascent, and wideners of the narrow way. Rome only, besides a clear and unhesitating

Digitized by Google

theology, has a great system of spiritual discipline of souls and consciences, and a moral character which results from it and corresponds with it; she only has the secret of a searching and elevating ministry—she only dares to realize that she professes. Protestants, on the other hand, proceed the Roman doctors, will have an easy religion. They want a speedy remedy for conscience. They want to be forgiven at once, every time they sin, and to feel assured that they are so; and for this they invented justification by faith. They want to get rid of the reality of repentance. They want to choose their own way of fulfilling their duty. What they rebel against in the Roman Church, is such real aids and obligations to strictness of life as confession and sacramental absolution. Their self-indulgence shrinks from direction, because the two are incompatible. Rome, only, brings the sinner before his God. Rome, only, will not temporise and parley with the self-deceit of the will. Rome, only, secures penitence by acts. She, only, inherits the spirit of the ancient Church—its inexorable hatred of sin. Conscience cannot escape from her strong grasp, and personal questioning. She leaves it without excuse; and shrinks, as from a profanation, from offering it any relief, except what is real. Rome will give a religion of mercy and consolation, but not an easy religion, not a religion of the world.

This is one popular way of presenting the claims of the Roman Church. If Protestants, then, should object to Port-Royal an exaggerated notion of the sacerdotal office, and of the claims and responsibility of the director—if *they* had charged it with giving too real a sanctity to ordinances, and making religion too strict for man—Roman Catholics, it might have been supposed, could have seen nothing but a consistent carrying out of the principles of the Church. When Port-Royal complained so bitterly of playing with the discipline of the confessional, or the ineffable sanctity of the Eucharist, the complaints, to Roman Catholics, would have at least *meaning*. Injudiciously, perhaps, but surely not groundlessly, the Port-Royalists only wanted to take their Church at her word, and to turn the edge of that primitive and Catholic discipline, which cut so deep in controversy with heretics without, against worldliness, and connivance with worldliness, inside the Church. They would seem to be only holding up to the careless multitudes within her pale the standard of religious depth and reality, which her divines presented to their opponents as incapable of accommodating itself to what the world asks for in religion.

But, it seems, they were mistaken. Bossuet thought them in extremes, though he had many points of sympathy with them. But if we are to take such representations as have just been

Digitized by Google

given, with the air of authority, of the spirit and demands of the Church, their view was radically false. The system which looked so uncompromising and stern in dealing with the individual conscience, when turned towards those without, must wear quite a different aspect when turned to those within;—with whom it is no longer a question about what will best silence them, but about what they can best be got to submit to; In presenting that discipline before them, theologians are, it seems, to remember before what sort of persons it is held up; they are masses of variable character, who look with an evil eye on restraints and inconveniences—a multitude of believers, indeed, but a very mixed one, whose general good will may be trusted, but not to the extent of submitting to any very sharp pressure. Unstable, wayward, halting between right and wrong, it takes but a little to scare or offend them; their worldliness, unruliness, suspiciousness, obstinacy, feebleness, are to be lamented, but, if the Church is to control them, must be allowed for. When speaking of discipline within the Church, the standard is to be set for the weak, the capricious, the self-willed, who form the bulk of actual living mankind. Hold up before *them* the rule of the strong and the perfect, and it is simply driving them from the altar and the confessional.[1] Have, by all means, a high standard besides; have it for the strictly disposed, and keep it for them; but with the multitudes you must be easy, or they will break from you altogether.

We will venture to say that, were he in controversy with an Anglican or a Lutheran, no divine in France would insist more strongly and more feelingly on the austere sanctity of Roman Catholic discipline than M. Maynard. Not Port-Royal itself would be more absolute in statement or inexorable in logic. But he is dealing with domestic difficulties, and with discipline as a system to be realized. In the former case he might have claimed for his communion the maxims of S. Augustin and S. Bernard. In the present, he puts the Jansenist rigorists to confusion by appealing to the indulgent good sense of men of the world, the *mitis sapientia* of the court of Charles II. This may be very sensible; only, what is now the recommendation and boast of the Roman system, when dealing with the necessities of the faint-hearted and petulant multitude within, is, after all, its old taunt against Protestantism—that it is an easy religion.

[1] 'Si l'absolution,' says P. Caussin, 'doit être refusée à ceux que l'espérance d'être absous a portés à pécher avec plus de facilité, *l'usage de la confession devra-t-il pas être interdit à la plupart du monde? et il n'y aurait plus d'autre remède aux pécheurs qu'une branche d'arbre et une corde.*'—'Le P. Caussin a raison en somme,' observes M. Maynard, vol. ii. p. 24.

Digitized by Google

Here, then, we observe *another* aspect of the Roman Church; we do not say that it is not a practical and natural one, but it is *another*. Indeed, the truth is, that in this discussion, our feeling varies, according as we view things broadly or in detail. Look at the discipline of the Church in the gross, and the Jesuits seem to have a good deal to say. They professed to be indulgent, yet watchful and persevering. Look at the special and necessary parts of its machinery, and the way in which it affects theological questions, and Port-Royal seems irresistible. We cannot help allowing the practical common sense of the Jesuit view of mankind, and the way to get hold of them; but it is equally obvious, that it led them into a most singular maze of theological entanglement, and that the intermediate steps which linked their most unbending dogmatism with the infinite wants and changes of living character, were a series of slippery and prevaricating inventions, without even the poor merit of real subtlety. Keep out of sight what absolution is held to be by the Roman Church, and we think only of the charitable condescension which brings home to the individual penitent the prospect of mercy, and faints not, nor despairs, though ever so often disappointed. But view absolution, not as a subsidiary portion of a great practical machinery for dealing with the waywardness of man, but in itself—as it is defined and zealously exalted in decrees of councils and commentaries of divines, the certain channel of justification—and the condescension seems a strange one, which cheapens such a gift into a mere auxiliary and complement to the most incipient and tentative act of improvement. Yet, it may be said, what were the Jesuits to do? The Roman Church had strictly defined what absolution was, and to maintain, in its integrity, the Roman dogmatism, was the end and the pride of their institute. On the other hand, in popular practice absolution was inseparably connected with confession, and compensated for its burden. The two things went together, and could not be separated. Their theological duty to Rome led them to extend and enforce to the uttermost the unrestricted and literal interpretation of her language; their practical duty, to keep up the attachment of the masses to her discipline. They were debarred by the one from restricting the effect of the sacrament; by the other, from making difficulties in the way of its reception. In their theology, it was all, and even more than all, that any Catholic doctors had made it: in their practice, it must sink to be a solace and encouragement, not to be easily denied even to the lowest and most doubtful class of penitents. To those who objected, they had the practical argument, that nothing less than this *encouragement* would bring men to confess. Absolution, whatever it was, was indis-

pensable. Yet Port-Royal had logic on its side, and right reason and feeling too, when it urged that this was a tremendous price to pay for keeping up a popular system of confession; that it was sacrificing absolution to confession—a divine sacrament and supernatural gift to moral control and moral training for the lowest of Christians. They only urged indisputable truth, when they said that, doctrinally, absolution had never been held to be the preliminary, but the end and crown of Christian repentance and amendment. As disputants, they tore to pieces the flimsy refinements with which the Jesuits reconciled their theology with their practical system: as Christian divines, they raised their voice in behalf of the reality and the seriousness of Christian penitence, and denounced the fearfully short-sighted wisdom, which, for any seeming advantages, could undermine the sincerity of character, by attempting to fight self-deceit with weapons of its own.

But however accounted for, here is *another* aspect of the Roman Church. And it is hard to see how, if it is true, the former one is not, we will not say untrue, but greatly exaggerated. We repeat, we are not undertaking to pass judgment on the internal quarrels of the Roman Church, or to say which is the true interpretation of the Council of Trent about contrition and attrition. But we observe this: that in fixing, for practical discipline, among themselves, the *minimum* of moral disposition sufficient for justification and salvation, modern Roman doctors, claiming very loudly to speak for their Church, *pronounce*, and *pronounce for certain*, on *a very low one:* the *minimum*, be it observed, not for *ecclesiastical* pardon, for long-suffering, or encouragement, or hope, but for present justification, for giving the sinner the *assurance*, on the highest earthly warrant, that God has actually blotted out his sins, and restored to him His favour. And they do it on the express ground that nothing else will work; that the mass of men must have this assurance or revolt from religion.

If this is so, however it be explained, it is not too much to say, that no Evangelical doctrine which connects instant and actual justification, over and over again, with the act of faith, short of avowed Antinomianism, can *require*, in the way of moral disposition, *less*. A religion which allows the sinner to set his conscience at rest, and feel complete assurance of pardon and justification, with no moral qualification but sorrow and fear—except in promise,—which allows its teachers to say, that contrition is so far beyond the reach of ordinary Christians, that to insist on it to them is to narrow, and almost evacuate the mercy of the Gospel,—which allows its discipline to be controlled by theories and practical rules, which, if true, turn nine-

tenths of all the sermons on repentance into mere declamation, —we do not say, must be, but certainly *may be*, in the hands of those who choose, logically and consistently, an easy religion; and has extremely little reason to taunt other systems with theories, which make too free with the terms of the Gospel, and yield too speedy a cure to the smarts and impatience of conscience.

From theological let us proceed to moral explanations. How does M. Maynard deal with the broad fact of Pascal's mass of startling extracts from the popular Casuists? We will state generally the grounds to which he appeals, before we illustrate them by instances. First, he has recourse to the counter charge of false quotation and misconstruction—a very good answer, so far as it is true, but a dangerous one to quibble about; and no other name can be given to a very large proportion of M. Maynard's criticism. He will scarcely ever trust us with a passage quoted in full. He prefers to give what he calls analyses or *exposés* of so and so's doctrine, smooth, guarded, and pointless, which present a far more curious contrast when compared with the downright original, than any of Pascal's unfairnesses. Then, as we have already said, he complains of Pascal's always quoting Escobar and Bauny, which, if Escobar and Bauny spoke only for themselves, might be reasonable; but as they carefully inform us, and the fact is plain on the face of it, that they are servile repeaters of a method which they thought every one accepted, and simply represent the latest results of the labours of others, whose wisdom all admire, it is not so much in place.[1] Then we

[1] The following is Escobar's account of his compilation:—'At ego solummodo memoro reserationem factam ab Agno suis auctoribus Jesuitis.... Qualibet igitur in materia in primis auctorum Societatis exhaurio, *Medullam Confessariorum in Examen exponendam*, indicatis generatim auctoribus. Mox circa materias singulas, speciales Doctorum meorum resolutiones ad principiorum generalium praxim attexo, jam specialiter auctorum nomina et scripta citans, jam sola nomina recensens. *Hoc ingenue profiteor, me nihil toto in hoc libello scripsisse, quod Societatis Jesu non acceperim ex Doctore.* Quas enim proprias passim resolutiones innuo, *ex schold Societatis aperte deductas existimarim.* Licet autem profiteor totum meum opus ex Societatis Doctoribus texuisse, *non ideo assero omnes sententias omnium* esse, (ut non bene Caramuel intellexit) sed singulas singulis tribuendas, ut aperte ostendo, dum fere nunquam pro una sententia, duos Doctores recenseo. *Dum autem eorum refero dictorum varietatem, non ideo me idem sentire affirmo.* Problematum moralium volumina quæ edidi, quæ digero post unam et alteram contradictoriam relatam sententiam, quid sentiam aperiunt. Porro licet Societati Jesu summula hæc omnem attribuit sententiam, *non ideo indico, propriam esse Societatis, nullam enim propositionem exprimo, quæ non possit gravissimis extra Societatem Doctoribus confirmari.* Quod si sæpe videar me laxioribus opinionibus adhærescere, id certe non est definire quid sentio, sed exponere, quid *sine conscientiæ lœsione Docti poterunt cum eis visum fuerit expedire ad sedandos pœnitentium animos, ad praxim adducere.*'

This edition, Lyons, 1659, after the date of the *Provinciales*, has the licence of the Provincial to print the book, (which had been *recognitus* by two fathers of the Society,) for nine years—dated 1644—the approbation of two doctors of theology of

are told that casuistry and moral theology are not popular sciences; that they are a system which cannot be understood, except as a whole; that questions necessarily are very different in the abstract and in practice; that when people have to deal with the infinity of human characters, and sins, and circumstances, the questions which must arise are necessarily intricate and strange; and that we have only to try and state in general terms any set of ordinary practical difficulties, and the ways by which we should ordinarily, in daily life, get through them, to see both how puzzling such subjects are, and how easy to make any *practical* general rules seem grossly lax. Then, it is suggested that we look differently on a crime *before* and *after* it has been committed; that we may forbid most severely, in the abstract, what, when it comes to be realized in a particular person, we do and must judge in a very different way; and that those decisions which shock us so much as they stand, in naked formality, would be applied by ourselves unconsciously, in the case of an actual penitent, whom we saw before us.

On these principles we are told that we may understand the purpose and meaning of these much vilified books. They were meant, not for lay Christians *before* the act, but for confessors *after* it; to teach the priest how to measure and deal with what could no longer be helped;—the utmost that he had a right to exact, and the least that he might accept;—not to teach the penitent the means of eluding duty, and still escaping sin. They represent not what men are to be taught to do, but only how far they may be allowed *not* to do as they are taught. 'They are not *receipts* given to penitents, to sweeten for them 'the remedy of confession, but rules of conduct and judgment 'for priests.' 'This simple reflection,' adds M. Maynard, 'causes 'to fall to the ground all the accusations of Pascal.' And they are to be considered as coming first to the knowledge of the penitent, and the mass of people, when applied to their case by the confessor. They were not intended for the public; they were written in Latin, and the world has no business to know these rules, nor Pascal to divulge them. Thus M. Maynard, after asking whether there is no danger in so many *subtle*

---

the University of Paris, a Carmelite and a Minor, certifying that they had found nothing in it dissonant from the Catholic. Apostolic, and Roman faith, and judged it worthy of publication, dated 1644; the licence of the ordinary in consequence of this approbation, and the consent and permission of the civil power.

He goes through, in the way of short questions and answers, the subject of Moral Theology, under seven heads, to which he applies in allegory the seven seals of the book of the Apocalypse. These are—*Laws, Sins, Justice, Censures, Virtues, State of Life, Sacraments:* each division, or *examen*, after discussing general principles, ends with a chapter of practical solutions, entitled 'Praxis ex Societatis Jesu Schola,' on the previous subjects.

Digitized by Google

questions on morality, in such speculatively bold decisions, which must necessarily '*briser* bientôt les liens de l'abstraction, pour 'entrer dans le domaine des faits,' thus answers:—

'*Peut-être.* Mais songeons bien *que les Casuistes n'écrivaient que pour les confesseurs, et non pour le monde*, encore moins pour les plaisants; que leur maximes, dont il peut être facile d'abuser, *ne s'adressaient pas à la foule ignorante ou corrompue, mais à des hommes graves, instruits, vertueux, &c.* . . . . Leurs livres *étaient écrits en Latin, qui n'est pas la langue de la multitude;* c'étaient *des énormes en folio*, inabordable à la foule légère, des œuvres à formes techniques et barbares, peu attrayantes pour la frivolité. Aussi étaient-ils renfermés dans les écoles et les bibliothéques, sans que jamais une main profane eût songé à les ouvrir pour en répandre le secret et le prétendu venin sur le monde. . . . . Tout cela devait rester un mystère entre le confesseur et la conscience coupable. Le poison, *si tant est que les Casuistes en renfermassent*, devait être exclusivement confié aux mains habiles et prudentes des médecins des âmes, qui l'auraient toujours transformés en rémède salutaire. Aussi Escobar, fut-il tout étonné du rétentissement que son œuvre avait en France. Cet humble religieux ne pouvait comprendre sa triste célébrité: cet homme, à l'âme et aux intentions si pures, *concevait encore moins qu'on détournât de leur sens et de leur but les conseils qu'il avait adressés exclusivement aux confesseurs*, pour les aider à diriger leurs frères dans la voie du bien.'—Vol. i. pp. 206, 207.

No doubt. The books might be written in Latin and in folio; the confessor as careful as he could be to keep Escobar out of 'profane hands.' But, besides that among people like the French, what was to be read in Latin could not long be kept secret from those whom it concerned—not to say that an indiscreet Père Bauny might publish French '*Sums of Theology*,'—it does not seem to have occurred to M. Maynard, that supposing a sufficient degree of intelligence and memory in the penitent, he might come to comprehend these rules by their application to his own case; and supposing him to be weak and self-deceiving, he might abuse this knowledge as much as if he had learnt it straight from Escobar or Pascal. And where every Christian was supposed to come to the confessional, and the mass of them to require the benefit of these indulgent decisions, it is not easy to suppose, with M. Maynard, that it is to Pascal and the Jansenists that the world in general is indebted for its knowledge that such decisions exist, or to imagine that it must have waited till it learned them from such informants, before it could have taken practical advantage of them. And with respect to M. Maynard's distinction, we must add, that a simple inspection of these books is sufficient to show that they were meant to tell the priest, not only how to judge of the past, but to advise about the future.

Thus, however, the inculpated system is defended—on the ground of its being a highly practical one. Its startling results are but the anomalies which attend all working systems.

Digitized by Google

Arguments may prove them wrong, but they turn out right in practice. But besides this, M. Maynard has two more defences in reserve. Side by side, or alternately, with the plea that it is *highly practical*, is the plea that it is *only speculative*. Having proved that it is intended only for the confessional, and that the confessional cannot do without it, M. Maynard offers us another point of view. It is, he says, the inevitable development of logical consequences; the mere course of abstract thought—subtle intellect, analysing metaphysically, or playing with possibilities, in the greater men; simple '*logomachies*' in the lesser. '*Systems of morality*,' says M. Maynard, '*about which we may dispute for ever, have no serious influence on life*;' and this casuistry was a '*veritable science, more metaphysical than moral, which, on pain of appearing incomplete, was bound to embrace all questions that were possible and even chimerical.*'[1] Its startling conclusions were simply the result of 'studies purely speculative.'[2] Even those about duelling, tyrannicide, and killing false witnesses, which were condemned for their practical danger by the Pope, 'were certainly,' we are informed, 'admissible in principle and in theory.'[3]

Finally, when, in some particular case, the general suggestions of its being practically useful, or merely speculative, or both, have been gone through, and we have been further reminded of that '*candid and charitable simplicity*, which would not impose on 'the weak shoulders of men anything more than the least heavy 'burden possible, and sometimes placed itself outside the Gospel 'in seeking to reconcile our duties and our miserable doings,' he treats the whole matter as a trifle not worth talking about—as something, on the face of it, absurd and impossible, except as a little flourish of sportive subtlety; and turns round on us and laughs in our face, for being such simpletons as to suppose, that the inculpated Casuist ever meant his words to be taken in earnest.

We are rather at a loss to describe the general effect upon our mind of M. Maynard's way of arguing. It is, more than anything we can bring to mind, like the equestrian performer, who is carried round the ring, jumping from one horse's back to the other. The Abbé employs two main principles, the necessities of a practical, and the liberty of a speculative system; and his argument has the appearance of invoking, as soon as he is embarrassed in the use of one, the assistance of its apparently discordant opposite. Thus it proceeds, through a series of alternations, to its triumphant close. And at length, when it

[1] Vol. i. [2] Vol. i. p. 200. [3] Vol. i. pp. 200, 205, 309.

Digitized by Google

ends, we are left to reflect whether what has so much engaged our attention is anything more than elaborate nonsense.

M. Maynard's mode of defence will be best understood by an instance or two.

It may be remembered, for instance, that Pascal quotes a number of remarkable dicta about duelling, and homicide in general. M. Maynard deals with them at considerable length. He notices that they arose in a state of society when there was little public law.[1] He reminds us that these decisions are of a *local* kind:—

'La doctrine, qu'on peut tuer pour l'honneur n'est guère admise que par les théologiens *étrangers, en Espagne surtout*, où l'honneur n'est pas *une passion* seulement, *mais une sorte de religion*. Les Jésuites inculpés sous ce rapport *ne se sont pas écartés de l'enseignement reçu dans leur pays. Ce peut être* un tort, mais on ne saurait leur en faire, sans injustice, un crime propre et personnel. Ces théologians se fondaient sur ce que l'infamie est pour un homme de cœur pire que la mort: il doit donc être permis de défendre l'honneur comme la vie elle-même.'

Critical persons might think it equally strange, that so large a proportion of Roman doctors as the theologians of Spain and Italy, should be called anywhere, even in France, '*étrangers*;' and that *local* feelings about honour and bloodshed should be a reason for their playing fast and loose with the Sixth Commandment. However, M. Maynard, after discussing the limits of what is allowable on the subject, thus sums up what he considers to be their real drift and purport:—

'Nous achevons cette discussion, sans craindre d'avoir mis le poignard aux mains des assassins, quoique nous ayons exposé, sans la frapper en général d'anathème, la doctrine des Jésuites. Nous ne croyons pas que jamais un glaive se soit aiguisé à ces théories *purement spéculatives, ou qu'on ne proposait pas pour règles de conduite, mais d'appréciation d'un fait accompli.* En les offrant aux confesseurs, les théologiens ne leur disaient pas: "Voilà ce que vous pouvez permettre, encore moins conseiller:" mais, "Voilà où il y a crime, voilà un fait moins coupable, voilà une défense entièrement légitime. Néanmoins, sans vous arroger la mission *de vouer à l'enfer* un meutrier qui n'a fait qu'user de son droit rigoureux, *ayez bien garde de le féliciter* de sa conduite, comme s'il avait accompli un acte de vertu, et engagez-le à préférer désormais à tout la divine douceur de l'évangile.

'Telle était la seule doctrine qu'on préchât au peuple. Les décisions de l'école, choquantes au premier aspect, moins choquantes *cependant dans les principes que dans les applications que les théologiens se croyaient obligés de donner toutes*, ne devaient pas être communiquées au public. Si elles présentent quelque danger, l'imprudence n'est pas dans les théologiens, mais dans ceux qui les ont divulguées.'—Vol. i. p. 313.

This is the *general* view of the matter. The theologians wished to secure a liberal and long-suffering considerateness in

[1] 'Les maximes des Casuistes sur l'homicide et le duel se sentaient nécessairement du régime féodal et barbare, dans lequel elles étaient toutes naturelles.'

the confessors whom they instructed. They were not to be hasty and sour, even with homicides. On the other hand, they were to 'take care not *to felicitate them on their conduct.*' The theologians had foreseen even this contingency, and provided against it.

But when we come to the decisions *one by one*, they are defended, not for their practical good, but for their impossibility. These nice rules, so minutely analyzed, these delicate balancings, so wisely adjusted by prudence and charity, finally turn, it appears, into nonsense when taken literally. The decision complained of is merely one of the *speculative* 'applications, of which the theologians thought themselves bound to give all.' The question is a minutely practical one; but the answer, though equally minute, is only speculative. The greatest subtlety and care are shown, for instance, in marking out when a duel may be fought; circumstances carefully distinguished, as whether 'a gentleman is known "*pour n'être pas dévôt,*"' so that he will be thought to act from fear of man and not of God, and so that men will call him, *gallina et non vir;* he is directed not to intend to fight a duel, but only to *walk about in a field*:—and the end of it all is, that we are informed, 'that this, though probable in speculation, is extremely difficult in practice,' and that the careful Casuist himself is related to have prescribed the contrary in his book '*De Charitate.*'[1]

Again, Molina names *about* the sum—four or five ducats—for *less than* which we *may not* kill a thief who is stealing, but will not 'dare to condemn' a man who kills for a crown or less; Escobar draws from Molina's estimate, that 'we may regularly '(*regulariter*) kill the thief for the value of a gold crown;' and Pascal represents Molina as estimating at *six or seven ducats* the value for which we *may* kill the thief. '*Voilà,*' says M. Maynard,[2] '*ce qui s'appelle une bonne calomnie.*' However, he gives up Escobar. Why is Escobar wrong?—for wrong he is,

---

[1] 'None of our duels,' he says, 'would find in these *purely metaphysical decisions*, any principle of justification.' (Vol. i. p. 322. Lett. 7me.) If Layman says, '*Je n'ose pas condamner,*'—(not '*je ne vois pas qu'on puisse condamner,*'—here is one of Pascal's 'falsifications,') 'a man who accepts a duel,' it is only in view of a '*considerable loss,*—which explains *the illusion of the Casuists*:' and besides, this is only in *rare cases, almost chimerical ones.*' (Vol. i. p. 325.) If Jesuits are quoted, saying that 'we may kill false-witnesses,' we are told that it was not they only, for 'that this doctrine was then common in the schools;' but the Jesuits regard it as lawful only '*en ce qui touche la conscience,* c'est à dire, suivant le droit naturel, rigoureux, en dehors des prohibitions positives, et des inconvénients qui en sont inséparable dans la pratique.' (Vol. i. p. 327.) 'The Casuists, evidently, reason almost always for men in a state of nature, obliged to do justice for themselves; this is what they call *speculation;* but in practice, that is, in the state of society, they forbid it absolutely.' (Vol. i. p. 334.)

[2] Vol. i. pp. 337, 338.

Digitized by Google

his proposition having found its way into the condemned list of Innocent XI. All that M. Maynard sees in it is excess of precision, whether over-speculative or over-practical, he does not say. It is morally impossible to fix the sum; and, he adds, 'l'Eglise *n'ayant rien décidé sur ce point,*' (*how much* the thief might be killed for,) '*et n'ayant condamné qu'une proposition,* '(31e du Décret d'Innocent XI.) *qui autorisait à tuer pour un* '*écu d'or,* somme régulièrement parlant insuffisante, *on doit être* '*très-réservé* à cet égard.'[1]

To take another subject, Pascal accuses the Casuists of explaining away the duty of attention in the acts of worship. The Church tells men to go to mass; it is hard to imagine for what purpose but to pray, and to pray rightly; and equally hard to imagine, how any other way of going could be prescribed, or thought of. But it was not so simple a matter, and gave rise to great questions, about how, and when, and with what intention the precept was to be satisfied. There were *pros* and *cons* on the subject; there was a severe school which exacted attention; another which maintained that the Church cannot command internal acts. As an extreme specimen of what *could be* put out to the world on this point, we will quote the following passage from Caramuel, whose name will be remembered by readers of Pascal—not a Jesuit, though a warm admirer of the order, and an enthusiastic votary of the *generous and clement* way of philosophising about moral questions. The Casuist Diana was said by envious rivals, '*esse agnum Dei, qui* '*tollit peccata mundi.*' Caramuel is explaining the phrase in Diana's honour:[2]—

'Let Navarrus,' he says, 'and the old Casuists have their own glory; let them be lions and get praise for their severity; be you the lamb, praised for benignity. Let those who please follow the lions—those who distrust with me their own frailty will more wisely follow you. *Hi sunt,*' he proceeds, '*qui cum mulieribus non sunt coinquinati virgines enim sunt, et sequuntur agnum quocunque ierit.*'

Of this he gives the following allegorical exposition:—

'*These* are the disciples and admirers of Diana. The opinions of Doctors at this day "*differunt genere.*" Some are *masculine,* others *feminine,* not to

[1] Vol. i. p. 310.

[2] It occurs in a letter to the Sicilian Casuist Diana, also not a Jesuit, in which Caramuel sets forth his friend Diana's European reputation and well-grounded claims to promotion at the hands of the Holy See. Diana was the Casuist whose 'industry had made many opinions probable which were not so before.' 'Tota æmulorum oblocutio pervenit ad columnas Herculis cum dicunt, Dianam esse *Agnum Dei qui tollit peccata mundi.* Idem ego frequenter inculco ut te commendem, . . . cujus industriâ multas opiniones evasisse probabiles quæ antea non erant. Si jam sint probabiles quæ antea non erant, jam non peccant qui eas sequuntur, licet antea peccaverint: ergo si ejusmodi peccata ab orbe literario Diana sustulit, merito dicetur esse *Agnum,*' &c.

Digitized by Google

speak of neuters. In the last century there were many moral opinions, defenceless, inconsistent, difficult, labouring under all the imperfection of women—they have been succeeded by others, well-guarded, consistent, and very easy; and they who look with favour on these later opinions are not only warriors but virgins. But why? I will shortly explain. Navarrus, and all who require internal attention in the Divine Office, for instance, considering the liveliness of the human mind, conclude that a man can scarcely or not at all satisfy the duty without some venial distraction; and so with equal solidity they philosophise about the other precepts. But we, who on the other hand take a generous view, and confirm our opinion by armed reasoning, are not only warriors but virgins: for we can so satisfy "the Hours," and also the other precepts of the Church, so as not to fall into even a light fault. For continued exercise (*prolatio*), and every external act, is most easy; and human laws of superiors, ecclesiastical or secular, do not enjoin internal ones. Then the conscience which has wrought without venial sin is a virgin, and most brave champion, which fears not to be conquered, for she cannot be, against her will. So we hold, and because hither we have been led by this "Regular" Lamb,[1] philosophising generously and with clemency, we follow the Lamb, (that is, Diana,) whithersoever he goeth. For we are sure that his doctrines are confirmed by so large a number of theologians, that it is enough, when any one asks whether this or that is lawful, to answer, AYTOΣ EΦA, *i. e. Diana dixit.*'—*Caram. Theol. Fundam.* pp. 23, 24. Francof. 1652.

An extravagance of the seventeenth century, it may be said. We should say so, for ourselves. This Caramuel von Lobcowitz we should have looked upon simply as the buffoon and jack-pudding of casuistry. But we are checked by M. Maynard, who, while disclaiming all obligation to defend one who was not a Jesuit, informs us that he was a 'Bishop, and a very virtuous 'one, though a man of ardent imagination rather than of solid 'judgment;' and, though allowing that Caramuel made many mistakes in his book, exerts himself with ludicrous gravity to put a creditable construction on his famous '*conclusio conclusionem*' and its corollary, why Jesuits may *not* kill Jansenists. And we find, further, that, whatever we may think of him, he had a brilliant and successful career.[2] 'His moral doc-'trines in theology, indeed, were so decried, that those who are 'furthest from rigorism would not like to be suspected of the 'smallest leaning towards his opinions;'[3] but they cannot be said to have hindered his honours or promotions.

---

[1] Diana was a Canon-Regular.

[2] He wrote seventy-seven large volumes. He converted 2,500 heretics. He fought against the Swedes at Prague, at the head of his troop of drilled ecclesiastics. He was the Envoy of the King of Spain to the Emperor. He shone at Salamanca, Alcala, and Louvain. He was successively titular Abbot of Melrose, and Vicar-General of the Cistercians in England, Abbot of Dissenburg, Bishop of Niessy, and Suffragan to the Archbishop of Mayence, Vicar-General to the Archbishop of Prague, Bishop of Königsgratz. The year after Pascal had been quoting him in Paris, Alexander VII. gave him the bishopric of Campagna, and to supply his printing expenses, the King of Spain that of Vigevano, in which he died in 1682.

[3] Biog. Univ.

Digitized by Google

But now, let us see how, not Caramuel, but M. Maynard, speaks of the kindred decision of certain theologians, that 'it 'was sufficient to be present at mass in body, though absent in 'mind, *pourvu qu'on demeure dans une contenance respectueuse* 'extérieurement.' On this, M. Maynard observes as follows; the diffidence of himself and his client are remarkable, in the presence of the 'great theologians,' whom they venture to differ from, or to follow with reluctance:—

'This decision, like the following ones, appears at least singular, in its abstract form. But it depends on a question long debated among theologians: whether the Church can command an internal act, either directly, or at least indirectly, so far as it is necessary for giving to the external act a real virtue. After a great number of authors whom he cites, Coninch maintains the negative, *out of respect*, he says, *for S. Thomas*,' (because there can be no command, but so far as there is power to *punish*, and, therefore, power to *judge:* and the Church, except in confession, can only judge and punish external acts.) 'According to this opinion, which we do not hold, but which has been defended by great theologians, Coninch advances, 1, That the ecclesiastical precept is satisfied by hearing mass without bringing to it any interior affection, provided that one be present with external respect, so as to exercise truly an external act of religion, and be in external communion of prayer with the priest. But, 2, he adds, what Pascal has taken good care not to say,—that a man so violates the precept of natural right, bidding us to attend mass with devotion, and sins against the respect due to God and the holy mysteries. Thus understood, the sentiment may be false, and we believe it such; but it does not in any way *facilitate the use of holy things*, and does not lead either to contempt of the sacrifice, or impiety, or even to negligence in the accomplishment of religious duties.'—Vol. i. pp. 435, 436.

Unless the restrictions reduce the rule simply to no sense at all, it certainly seems considerably 'to facilitate the use of holy things.' A precept of the Church—to violate which is mortal sin—about a religious act, which to be worth doing at all must be an inward act, yet restrained exclusively to the external act;—satisfied as a precept, yet involving sin in the mode of satisfying;—the doctrine maintained stoutly by great and wise doctors, and yet, though intelligible only as a practical matter, condemned by its maintainers, except in speculation;—all this presents a curious union of conditions. The practical Escobar, however, goes a step further. He lays down, that mass may be heard '*comme il faut*,' by a person not only absent in mind, but intent on bad thoughts, and present for the purpose of indulging them: '*qu'une méchant intention, comme de regarder* 'les femmes avec un désir impur, jointe à celle d'ouïr la messe 'comme il faut, n'empêche pas qu'on n'y satisfasse.' Very shocking, indeed, says M. Maynard; but what can you do? you may be out of temper with Escobar, but Escobar will answer you that he is simply arguing from a doctrine maintained by great

Digitized by Google

authorities, about the '*comme il faut*' of hearing mass: no one can help 'logical consequences:'—

'Cette vilaine proposition est inexcusable, bien qu'elle suive assez logiquement du sentiment que l'Eglise ne commande pas les actes intérieurs.'—Vol. i. p. 437.

Besides, he *supposes*, all the time, that the outward attention to the service is kept up simultaneously: 'il *suppose toujours, que l'attention extérieure subsiste.*' Then M. Maynard bids us observe that 'il ne justifie pas ces mauvais regards dans la circonstance, encore moins en eux-mêmes, et il y verrait volontiers un infâme sacrilége.' But having done what was candid in admitting, in Escobar's name as well as his own, that this would be '*un infâme sacrilége,*' and for himself, that Escobar's conclusion was a '*vilaine proposition,*' he proceeds to express his inability to see what can be the harm of it, or what people can mean by quibbling about such a trifle: '*Puis pour la pratique, il nous est impossible de comprendre en quoi tout cela peut nuire à la piété Catholique: ce sont de subtilités d'esprit misérables, scabreuses même, si l'on veut,*' (candid man!) '*et rien de plus.*' Why then put these *miserable subtleties* in practical books? Oh! he says, they have their use; practical questions for confessors may arise, which they may be wanted to answer. 'On pourrait, cependant, ajouter, que toutes ces questions n'étaient pas *absolument oiseuses,* et qu'elles *tendaient à décider* si, quelque pût être le péché commis par le pénitent pendant la messe, *il était obligé d'entendre une autre.*' So that rather than trust the confessor's common sense, to settle whether, to comply with the command of the Church, a man who had abominably profaned one mass was bound to hear another, Escobar might 'tend to decide it' by putting in his book that the Church's precept could be satisfied by an '*infâme sacrilége,*' without erring, apparently, in more than judgment. Is there much difference between Caramuel and M. Maynard?

We will take one more case;—that of what M. Maynard terms the 'theory of equivocations and mental restrictions:'[1] a theory, which, he says, 'had been known in the schools for two centuries;' and so far from the Jesuits having been its inventors, 'at the date of the *Provinciales,* it would not have been easy to find more than three or four theologians of an opposite sentiment.' 'A doctrine so universally adopted must have solid foundations;' and, as it has continued to be taught in the Church by strict theologians, even after the condemnation of certain propositions by the Pope, we must conclude that only its abuses were condemned.

[1] *Vide* Lettre IX.

Digitized by Google

How, he says, can you do without *some* theory to reconcile veracity with other often conflicting duties? and what harm can there be in *this* one, when its maintainers tell you never to apply or use equivocation when it is not right, or in a wrong way? The following *exposé* of its principles is stated to be but an analysis of the learned Jesuit Sanchez:—

'It is necessary,' he begins, 'first, to shelter from all accusation of falsehood divers holy personages of the Bible, who appear in word and deed to have departed from the way of simple and straightforward truth, *e.g.* Abraham and Isaac, Jacob calling himself the eldest son to his father, the angel of Tobias taking the name of some high person in Israel. Several saints of the New Testament appear to have had recourse to equivocation; and certain expressions of our Lord are hard to explain in their obvious and natural sense.'

Then after noticing that a man is often placed between contradictory obligations, he states as follows the distinctions by which the Casuists saved equivocation from the guilt of lying, and guarded its right use:—

'The objections to the "*system of equivocations*" are obvious; but any other system is just as open to difficulty, especially as applied to the facts of the Bible. Nevertheless, the holders of the system of equivocation could not rest under the charge of excusing lies and deceit. So they establish two sorts of restrictions, one allowed, the other forbidden; the "*purely mental*," where it is absolutely impossible to discover the truth, and the "sensible," of which the sense *might be discovered* by certain signs or circumstances, though more often it must remain hidden. Again, they distinguished between the equivocation *sensible*, and the equivocation *at pleasure* (*forgée à plaisir*), of which the meaning is purely *arbitrary*.

'In this manner, say they, not only is a person without the intention of deceiving, but he does not *necessarily* deceive at all, because it is *possible* to discover the truth; and there is no injustice, for it is assumed that one party has no right to know, nor the other to reveal the truth. So there is no wish to "*faire accroire une chose fausse*," as Pascal says; such an intention would be condemned by all theologians. Moreover, there is no mischief done to human society, for equivocations are not recurred to under every circumstance, but in exceptional cases, where there are grave inconveniences in discovering the truth, and a real necessity and duty to keep it silent.'—Vol. i. pp. 421, 422.

So far for *general* statement. If a theory were true because it is wanted, it is clear that it is often inconvenient, hard, undesirable—sometimes wrong, to state truth. But, as M. Maynard truly remarks, 'the real difficulty is in its application.' Does it help us out of our perplexities? The difficulties of astronomy remained after the invention of cycles and epicycles. M. Maynard admits, indeed, that in their application of the 'solid' and safe principles, the theologians were occasionally mistaken; but, 'why should that be made a crime in them?'

Pascal, for instance, quotes from Sanchez, '*that we may swear that we have not done something which we have done, by under-*

Digitized by Google

'*standing mentally, that we did not do it on such a day, or before* '*we were born, or with some such circumstances.*' Here is certainly a very definite way of using equivocation, and escaping, we are told, lying or perjury. M. Maynard appears to think that it only wants the rules, conditions, and restrictions, omitted by Pascal, to make it a practical solution of possible perplexities. But it seems, that all the conditions necessary are contained in the passage which we have quoted above—an analysis of this same Sanchez. M. Maynard is easily satisfied. Pascal goes on to another particular case, yet stronger. Filliucci is more definite even than Sanchez. M. Maynard *appears*—we cannot say for certain more—to accept this also, as a satisfactory way of escaping from the difficulties of veracity. At any rate he will not give up Filliucci. Pascal observes, that he says that Sanchez's method of equivocation is neither lie nor perjury:—

'Parceque c'est "l'intention qui règle la qualité de l'action." Et il y donne encore une autre moyen plus sûr d'éviter le mensonge. C'est qu'après avoir dit tout haut, *Je jure que je n'ai point fait celà*, on ajoute tout bas, *aujourd'hui;* ou qu'après avoir dit tout haut, *Je jure*, on dise tout bas, *que je dis;* et que l'on continue ensuite tout haut, *que je n'ai point fait celà.* Vous voyez bien que c'est dire la vérité. Je l'avoue, lui dis-je; mais nous trouverions, peut-être, que c'est dire la vérité tout bas, et un mensonge tout haut: outre, que je craindrais que bien de gens n'eussent pas assez de présence d'esprit pour se servir de ces méthodes. Nos pères, dit-il, ont enseigné au même lieu, en faveur de ceux qui ne sauraient pas user de ces restrictions, qu'il leur suffit, pour ne point mentir, de dire simplement, qu'ils n'ont point fait ce qu'ils ont fait, pourvu qu'ils aient en général l'intention de donner à leur discours le sens qu'un habile homme y donnerait.'

We will here quote the curiously stated decisions of the Penitentiary on '*Amphibologia,*' and then our readers may judge for themselves of M. Maynard's comments on him and on Pascal:

'Filliucci, after stating, on the question, "whether, if the *amphibologia* be solely mental, it is lawful to *swear?*"—that it *is a probable* opinion that it is *not* lawful, but a *more probable* one *that it is;* "for that, out of the word spoken and the mental restriction is made one compound speech in which is no falsehood, and that it is free for a man to compound his speech of terms spoken and mental;" and after proving this by S. Gregory, who says that "the Prophet sometimes joined the word which one sounded by the mouth, to the word of the mind, which is reason," confirms his position thus: "It is confirmed by the example of Christ's words, '*of that day no man knows,*' and '*I go not up to this feast,*' in which one thing is said in the outward words, and another understood in the internal ones." He then says that the mental restriction ought not to be arbitrary, but proportionate to the words and matter, so that, *with explanation*, the words might be understood in the intended sense; and he gives the following rules, "*ad utendum amphibologiâ.*"

'Fourthly, I inquire, with what caution must *amphibologia* be used? I answer, and say, first, besides what has just been observed, two modes may be assigned for persons endued with judgment; the first is, to

Digitized by Google

have the intention of expressing the outward words materially, and for greater security; when the person begins, for instance, by saying, *I swear that*—to interpose in a low voice the mental restriction, *to-day*—and then to add in a loud voice, "*I did not eat this or that;*" or, "*I swear that*"—then interpose, "*I say that*"—then finish in a loud voice, "*I did not do this or that:*" for *so the whole speech is most true.* The second way is, to have the intention of not completing the speech merely by external words, but, at the same time, with a mental restriction; for a man is at liberty to express his mind wholly or partially. But for the untaught, who cannot understand ambiguous expression in the particular, (*pro rudibus qui nesciunt in particulari concipere amphibologiam,*) it is sufficient if they have the intention of affirming or denying in the sense which in reality contains truth; for which it is necessary that they should know, at least in the universal, that they *can* deny in *some* true sense, otherwise they could not speak in a true sense.'

He then says that this mode of expression by ambiguous words, especially where the restriction is mental, is not to be used without a '*just cause;*' otherwise a fault is committed, and if with an oath, a grave fault; and proceeds to inquire *what* sort of fault. Is it a lie? and, if sworn to, perjury? He answers, that it is *probable* that it is, and gives reasons why; but *more probable* that it is not:—

'I say, in the second place, that it seems more probable that in strictness it is not a lie, or perjury. The principal reason is, that he who so speaks and swears has not the intention of saying what is false, or swearing to it, as is presupposed; and what is expressed, in strictness has *some* true sense, which the person intends; therefore he does not lie (from Navarr. cap. *Humanæ Aures,* 22, 9, 5). For the intention characterises (*discernit*) the action. It is confirmed from S. Thomas, 2. 2. 9, 55, Art. 3, where cunning (*astutia*) is said to be the vice contrary to prudence; but he who uses "*amphibologia*" is, at the utmost, astute; therefore, &c. . . But it is not repugnant to human truth and good faith, because it is not opposed to it by a defect of truth, but by an excessive occultation of truth. Hence it is that to confirm this by an oath is not strictly perjury, but a certain want of religiousness (irreligiositas quædam), and if there be scandal, from the outward semblance of perjury, it will be brought to the evil of that; which [evil] has most place in ambiguous expression with mental restriction, as Suarez rightly teaches.'—*Fill. Moral. Quæst.* Tr. xxv. cap. xi. nn. 325—331.

Such is Filliucci's statement, little more than copied, as is the wont of these writers, even to the illustrations, from a predecessor—in this case, one of the greatest of the Casuists, Suarez. M. Maynard thus excepts to Pascal's use of it:—

'We have nearly the same thing to say of Filliucci as of Sanchez. This principle, that "*the intention regulates the quality of the action,*" has been quoted by Pascal in a very dishonest way. It means merely that we must never, even in case of mental restriction, have the intention to deceive, but only to hide a truth which our neighbour has no right to know. Such is also the sense of the general rule, "*to have the intention to give to our words the sense which a clever man* (*un habile homme*) *would give them.*" This rule is for the ignorant who may use ambiguous terms (*cette règle est pour les ignorants qui useraient d'amphibologie*). As it is never allowed to speak

contrary to our thought, then, if they do not understand the expedient which they use, (*s'ils ne comprennent pas le tour dont ils se servent,*) they ought to have the intention in general of giving to it the sense which a clever man would give it.'—Vol. i. p. 425.

There is something delightful in the simplicity with which M. Maynard disposes of the matter, by merely tacitly translating the restriction which Filliucci thinks sufficient. We must add, as we have so often had the distinction between speculation and practice, that Suarez, the original authority, assures us that this doctrine, so stated, is '*practice securissima.*'[1]

These are the sort of subjects on which, according to M. Maynard, men cannot be expected to be of one mind—the subjects to which the doctrine of Probabilism applies. 'If there 'are in morals some points which are certain, there are others 'which are not, which come into the domain of the probable, 'and of opinion. Do what we will, take up what system we 'please, there will always be controverted principles, embar- 'rassing cases, through which we cannot guide ourselves by a 'certainty and evidence which do not exist, but only by the 'glimmering twilight of reasons or authorities more or less 'plausible.'[2] The men whom Pascal accuses of such diversity of sentiment, are, he says, agreed, 'first on all the principles 'which are certain or defined by Scripture, tradition, and the 'Church; then on all the doctrines commonly received in the 'Catholic schools. As for *controverted opinions*, whatever 'system of morals we embrace, we shall never be agreed.'[3]

But he treats with scorn the idea that these open questions, and, as he allows very often, singular solutions of them, could have the smallest effect on feeling, opinion, or practice. He coolly parallels them to the books of medical and legal science,—an analogy which might perhaps do for the questions, if they had not the answers to them. We must oppose to M. Maynard's opinion, one which on this point is at least as 'probable.' On a matter of fact, at least, the authority of the famous Caramuel may be of weight. An injudicious director may yet be a fair witness, especially against himself; and so great was his confidence in his favourite science, that he could afford the admission that M. Maynard shrinks from. Caramuel attests the fact, that 'inconvenience' did result from many of the most probable opinions of the schools; only he thinks it a very paltry argument to infer, that therefore they are not probable:—

'You will say that from this doctrine,' [he is speaking, we may observe, of the famous *conclusio conclusionum* of Pascal's seventh Letter,] 'many inconveniences arise, and therefore it is to be rejected. And I answer, that

[1] Suarez de Rel. tom. ii. tr. 4. lib. iii. c. 10. n. 4.
[2] Vol. i. p. 199.
[3] Vol. i. p. 241.

Digitized by Google

to say, "From such and such an assertion great dangers and mischiefs arise, therefore it is false," is not a good consequence.' [He then instances, *e. g.* an assertion which might throw a whole kingdom into a revolution, yet would not be the less true, and proceeds—it will be observed that we are quoting him only as a witness to fact.] 'Hence it is that I judge that the *highest inconveniences* (*summa inconvenientia*) *follow from many opinions, which are at this day in vogue in the schools, yet that these opinions are not therefore improbable.* For many inconveniences arise from *mental restrictions;* many from *secret compensations;* many from *the permission to kill an unjust judge or witness,* which some grant; many also from the opinion which teaches, that *of secret things the Church judges not;* many from others: notwithstanding which inconveniences, these opinions, in the terms in which they are at this day delivered in the schools, are at the very least most probable, and may not be condemned by any (*sunt ad minimum probabilissimæ, et a nemine damnari possunt*).'—*Theolog. Fundam.* No. 1150. Ed. Franc. 1652.

To this we are quite aware that there is a summary and specious answer. It is, that the Popes, in spite of Caramuel, *have* condemned these discreditable opinions, and banished them for ever from the teaching of the Church. Whatever might be said inconsiderately in 1650, yet when Alexander VII. and Innocent XI. spoke, a few years later, Jesuits and all submitted with absolute reverence to the decision of Rome, and no theologian can be cited who has since then said these things.

To this a rejoinder might be supposed, that it was but a make-believe condemnation, or one brought about accidentally by the policy or revenge of the moment; that when Rome meant to condemn in earnest, as in the case of the Jansenists, there was no mistake in her way of doing it; that here, though she happened to fix on most of the propositions quoted by Pascal, she simply condemned them in their bare literal sense, and said nothing as to why and how she condemned them; that Casuists might still treat the censures as sullen lawyers do an Act of Parliament,—maintain that their method was unrebuked, and that the propositions were condemned, not as morally shocking, but merely verbally inexact, and might still hold others next door to them with impunity. It might be urged, that apparently they had only become wrong, since and because the Popes condemned them, and their previous tolerance indicates that it was little more than a formal stigma.

On the other hand, it might be said, that it is unfair thus to explain away the obvious purport of the Popes' act; that we ought to take it for what it looks like—the condemnation of a dangerous mode of thought or expression in certain palpable samples of it, as Jansenism was condemned in the Five Propositions, or in the 101 of the Bull *Unigenitus;* that the propositions are nearly the same as those which Bossuet got condemned by the Assembly of 1700, and we know that he condemned in them the spirit and system which had produced them.

Digitized by Google

Now how does M. Maynard deal with this? For it is obvious that for him, in proportion as it removes one difficulty, it brings in another. Apparently, at least, if it clears the Popes, it compromises the Casuists; and in proportion as we give weight and significance to the condemnation, it seems to fix on them the load of a mischievous and at length intolerable teaching,—intolerable even to that very authority of which they were the champions. The fact, of course, he more than admits. 'Long before 1679,' he says, 'the Jesuits had been able to 'cite more than thirty of their theologians, anterior even to 'the *Provinciales*, on *the necessity of the love of God in peni-* 'tence. With much stronger reason, then, did they abstain, 'after the pontifical sentence, to teach any of the propositions 'condemned by Innocent XI.'[1] Whether the mistake was practical, 'these men, who were led astray by benevolent and 'pure intentions, to impose on weak men the least burden 'possible,—renounced their error as soon as it was pointed out 'to them *by their superiors*, and especially *by the Holy See;* and 'thus the evil was dried up at its source;'[2] or whether it was but mere speculation, 'they renounced even their abstractions, 'as soon as any point of doctrine had been prescribed by the 'Holy See. Thus it would be impossible to cite a single theo- 'logian who has permitted *the murder of the unjust judge, or of* 'the *false witnesses*, since the censure of the 18th proposition of 'the decree of Alexander VII.; and the most celebrated authors,' it is added, with some boldness of assertion, 'had not waited till 'then to condemn it in their works.'[3] We do not for a moment doubt the submission; yet M. Maynard seems to make more of a merit of it than is quite intelligible. The sacrifice of submitting to be debarred from such propositions as that 'the love of God is not necessary for penitence,' or that 'we may seek occasions of sin for our own good or that of our neighbour,' does not seem so very hard, any more than the glory very singular of not having maintained them.

But we should, it appears, be grossly mistaken, if we saw in these censures any such condemnation, or even discountenancing, of principles, or methods of arguing or stating, as the Bull *Unigenitus* is of Jansenism as a whole. The decrees of Alexander and Innocent are, we are told to observe, censures, not of doctrines, but of *propositions*. The propositions are given up, of course; and there is an end of the matter. But the authors are not named, and are therefore untouched. What the Church *has* decided upon is nothing but certain extreme and lax applications of a recognised way of treating moral questions. The

[1] Vol. i. p. 183. [2] Vol. i. p. 210. [3] Vol. i. p. 304.

Digitized by Google

propositions are to be taken one by one, as separate, isolated, for the most part trifling, or accidental mistakes, each to be set down to the account of him who made it: and who does not make mistakes? And as we are not to gather from the censure that the Church meant to notice them as an aggregate and significant phenomenon, such as Pascal sees in them; so, on each subject touched by the propositions, beyond the strict letter of the proposition censured the condemnation does not reach.

It was, for instance, as M. Maynard tells us, a *common doctrine* at the time *in the schools*[1]—by no means confined to the Jesuits, and, indeed, not accepted by several of them—that it is lawful to kill beforehand false witnesses against us. 'Speculatively, indeed,' says M. Maynard,[2] 'it will be legitimate, for it 'flows logically from natural right, general principles, and 'analogy with permitted cases;' and it is difficult to see in what this 'horrible consequence' 'differs from the case of unjust aggression and lawful self-defence.' And the theologians 'added almost always,' that speculatively only was it lawful. Turned into practice, 'it would involve an almost inevitable sin.' Therefore, and so far only, it was condemned. The practical dangers (which for once M. Maynard admits) 'caused to be 'absolutely condemned by the Popes a certain number of pro-'positions on this subject, *certainly admissible in principle and 'in theory. But the theologians who confined themselves within 'the limits of pure abstraction and metaphysical precision are 'not touched by these censures.*' The general doctrine on homicide, which Pascal imputes to the Jesuits, is not merely unjustly made peculiar to them, but 'has never been condemned by the Church.'[3] So with the '*systême des équivoques,*' which we have already alluded to:—

'The adversaries of this system,' says M. Maynard, 'object to the propositions condemned by Innocent XI. and the Clergy of France in 1700. It would be singular enough,' he proceeds, 'that if the system of equivocations was absolutely condemned, it should continue to be taught by a great number of theologians with the full cognizance of the Church, and by theologians, too, very little suspected of relaxed moral opinions. . . . We must suppose, therefore, that it is only the abuses and excesses of the system which are touched by the censure. That this answer is founded in reason may be seen by the examination of the condemned propositions. The 26th of Innocent XI. permits, without distinction, every restriction, even purely mental, under every circumstance, with or without reason; the 27th measures the use of it only by the private advantage of him who uses it, without regard to the public interest, often opposed to private, or to the exceptions laid down by theologians; the 28th authorizes reservations in cases where the public good, law, and morality require a plain and straightforward oath, by a culpable abuse of the principle, that a man is

[1] Vol. i. p. 327. [2] Vol. i. pp. 303, 304. [3] Vol. i. p. 310.

Digitized by Google

not obliged to avow a secret crime; and in other ways it tends to favour intrigue and bad means of arriving at employments.'—Vol. i. pp. 423, 424.

Again, P. Bauny asks, '*Les valets qui se plaignent de leurs gages* '*peuvent-ils d'eux-mêmes les croître en se garnissant les mains* '*d'autant de bien appartenant à leur maîtres, comme ils s'ima-* '*ginent en être nécessaire pour égaler les dits gages à leur peine?*' and answers, '*Ils le peuvent, en quelques rencontres, comme lors-* '*qu'ils sont si pauvres en cherchant condition, qu'ils ont été* '*obliger d'accepter l'offre qu'on leur a faite, ou que les autres* '*valets de leur sorte gagnent d'avantage ailleurs.*' '*Voila,*' says M. Maynard, '*encore une matière fort délicate.* Innocent XI. and the Assembly of 1700 have condemned the proposition, that '"*men-servants and maid-servants may take in secret from their* '*masters, wherewith to compensate their labour, which they judge* '*to be greater than the salary which they receive.*"' This seems absolute and clear; and M. Maynard says it is a blameable doctrine, inasmuch as it leaves the estimation of the value to the interested party, and opens the gate to an infinity of domestic thefts. But, he adds, not even P. Bauny taught this proposition. What he exactly means by this we are at a loss to understand, unless he means that P. Bauny used *other words.*

But he proceeds himself to ask,—'Follows it from this that 'in certain circumstances, infinitely rare if we please, servants 'may not use secret compensation?' He replies that, under certain conditions—*e.g.* the certainty of the debt—its being a matter of rigorous justice—impossible to be otherwise recovered —free from scandal or injury to a third party—and the debtor not liable to have to pay twice,—it is 'certainly permitted,' to creditors in general. The concourse of conditions is rare, and therefore it is a question rather speculative than practical; but where they do concur, all theologians allow it. And why should *servants* be excepted? By all means, he says, make more severe conditions for them, as they are more liable to make mistakes—'*à la bonne heure—mais doit-on les priver* '*absolument du droit de compenser eux-mêmes les injustices de* '*maîtres durs et impitoyables? Les théologiens, Jésuites ou non,* '*n'ont pas eu ce triste courage.*' They justify the principle by the example of Jacob and Laban, and 'leave the domestics in 'the condition of other creditors, only with greater limitations,' all which, we are told, P. Bauny gives. The permitted cases are, 1, when agreement for increase of wages in proportion to increased usefulness is not kept; 2, when servants have been *forced* into a service for fear of starving. But Bauny excepts from this liberty the case of servants, 1, taken out of pure compassion; or, 2, at their own request; or, 3, not under worse

condition than others. '*Avec ces limitations, la décision de Bauny n'est pas dangereuse, surtout si le confesseur est laissé juge, et bien rarement trouvera-t-il son application.*'[1] And thus the honour and the intention of both Pope and Casuist, though seemingly of directly opposite views, are judiciously reconciled. But it brings forcibly before us how difficult a thing it must be to 'condemn' a proposition.

So much for the effect of the condemnation. It is a *fait accompli*, to be treated with all respect. But M. Maynard suggests that its importance is still further diminished, if we consider its history:—

'Madame de Sevigné is too amusing,' he observes, 'when she affects so much pity for her "*pauvres frères*," whom she makes into victims when they were really persecutors.... "When they did not consult the Pope," she says, "they were schismatics; when they complain to him about these *opinions probables*, they are rebels." *Eh! oui, sans doute, Madame;* they first did not consult the Pope, for fear of hearing the condemnation of their heretical doctrines; they afterwards have recourse to him to denounce faithful priests, and trouble further the Church and the State. In the first case, were they not *schismatics;* in the second, *rebels? Louis XIV. was therefore wise in placing his agents on the great roads, to prevent any such communications between the Pope and the Jansenists.* But he did not succeed in barring that passage to them, and the denunciation reached Innocent XI. The Pope then pronounced on the question of fact, not on that of right, and condemned, in 1679, the sixty-five propositions, as he was bound to condemn them, wherever found, to show that the Church does not approve laxities in morality. But he did not attribute them to the Jesuits, or condemn them as corrupters of morality.'—Vol. i. pp. 182, 183.

But, though it might have been owing to the unfortunate failure of the efforts of Louis XIV. to stop them, that the Jansenists succeeded in forcing the Pope to consider an inopportune question, his decision, when forced, could be but one way, and was right. A modest foot-note, however, ventures further to insinuate the intrusion of a cause which takes off still more from the real, though not the formal effect of the act. The Jesuits knew the Pope's duty better than himself sometimes; but a price must be paid for helping a man in spite of himself:—

'We must observe, however, that Innocent XI. did not love the Jesuits, and wished to change their Institute. He was a great and holy Pontiff, but inflexible even to harshness, jealous of his rights even to obstinacy, and impracticable when his authority was in question. In the affair of the Regale, the Jesuits had shown themselves more French than Roman. He had sent them his briefs, which the Parliament suppressed, with orders to publish them and certify their authenticity. The Jesuits remained neuter, *et ne voulurent pas se rendre impossibles en France en s'opposant aux lois du royaume.* He had even entrusted to P. Dez a brief of excommunication against Louis XIV., but the Jesuit took care not to publish it. He kept it secret, to leave the Pope time for reflection; and in fact Innocent XI. withdrew it himself, acknowledging in the end how wise had been the

[1] Vol. i. pp. 294—296.

Digitized by Google

conduct of the Jesuits. This however did not prevent him from entertaining a grudge against them; and *the condemnation of the sixty-five propositions, though just in itself, was without doubt an act of revenge.*'—Vol. i. p. 183.

From a writer who, in the case of Jansenism, argues that Infallibility means nothing unless it includes Infallibility as to fact, this is remarkable. Which is the true interpretation of the censures, must be settled between those who think most about the meaning of the propositions, and those who feel most about the honour of the Jesuits. It is at least ambiguous, whether it is public feeling or the censures of Rome, which prevents Escobars and Caramuels from appearing now.

Such is M. Maynard's way of vindicating a system, whose speculations and practical decisions ranged with equal boldness and equal solemnity, and with equal arbitrariness in relaxing or tightening, from the obligation of the first and great commandment to the problem whether chocolate were meat or drink,[1] or whether, and in what shape, using tobacco violated the eucharistic fast.[2] We are familiar with the gross exaggerations of its meaning and design, made for party purposes—for a Maynooth bill, for instance—on one side. Here we have equally gross shuffling and effrontery, to get rid of obvious facts, on the other.

---

[1] '*Quid de potione in Hispania, aut Occidentali India, dicta vulgo "chocolate?*" Aliquando dixi pro potu haberi, sed parum meriti jejunio relinquere ob vires, quas jejunanti adjicit, omnino inedia sublata, aut impedita; nec absolute cuperem usum hujusce potionis, uti mortificationi jejunii ab Ecclesiæ intentæ apprime adversantem; at *magis authoritati adhærens quam rationi*, potum esse assero, sed non uti condit abusus, sed quemadmodum potio ab Indis ad Hispaniam pervenit. Unde "*chocolate*" ovis aut lacte conditum potus non est, sed cibus substantialissimus. Item hujusmodi potio admodum crassa in notabili quantitate jejunium violat. Verum "*chocolate*" liquidum adeo, ut unicæ potioni uncia una adhibeatur saccharo necessario potus est, et absque scrupulo absumi potest. Unicam potionem appello quod capit commune vas, quod *vicara* vulgo assolet appellari. Quod si assignata proportione ea potionis quantitas condiatur, licet vas non semel evacuetur, jejunium non solvitur, temperantia fortasse violata, quia potus est, quemadmodum de vino asserimus.'—*Escobar*, Tr. i. Exam. xiii. cap. 3. Praxis sec. *S. J. de Jejunio.*

[2] 'II[a] regula est: ad frangendum jejunium requiritur ut accipiatur aliquid per modum comestionis aut potationis: quare *communiter* dicunt Suar. Lugo, Conc. Holzm. Ronc. Escob. Croix, Elb., *quicquid dicant aliqui pauci*, non lædere jejun. tabacum per nares sumtum, licet aliquid illius descenderet in stomachum, ratione allatâ . . . saltem ait Bened. XIV. hoc est permissum propter usum universalem inter fideles receptum.

'Pariter, tabaci fumus ore haustus non frangit jejun., ut etiam communiter docent Suar. Vill. Trullenc. &c. cum eodem Bened. XIV. qui similiter testatur hanc *esse hodiernam consuetudinem, confirmatam communi DD. consensu.* Limitant tamen Salmant., et dicunt frangere jejun. qui ex proposito transmitteret fumum in stomachum, dicendo quod hæc esset vera comestio, dum talis fumus etiam aliquo modo nutriret; sed hæc limitatio communius et probabilius negatur ab Escob. Præp. March. Viva, Spor. Renzi. Tamb. Diana, &c. Et ratio est, quia fumus non sumitur per modum cibi, nec est cibus in se comestibilis aut manducabilis, quem voluerit Ecclesia prohibere, juxta communem DD. sensum.'—*Liguori, Hom. Ap.* Tract. xv. p. 3, n. 38, 39.

Digitized by Google

We are not going here to reduce and adjust these rival extravagances; but it may be said, that to fair examination, the truth does not seem to lie very deep.

If we look into its history, its first cause is to be sought in the inherited habits of thought, which had been formed in the middle age schools. The extravagant licence of speculating and deciding had passed from doctrine to questions of morality and conscience; it was the fashion and mania of the day; serious men competed in the hardihood and strangeness of their solutions, and good men seemed to take a pride in finding out how much they could allow—in speculation at any rate—to be lawful. Conditions, restrictions, distinctions multiplied of course; but so did the authorities and decisions, inventing doubts, extending liberty, and taking away scruples. It is all done in these countless folios of Moral Theology, just as if it had no more to do with real human action than with the movements of the stars—all for the mere pleasure of speculating, and with the zest of a race in avoiding a corner, and the inventiveness of a legal debate, in pressing or giving the slip to the letter of an Act of Parliament.

Its next cause was the practical needs of casuistry—the endeavour to fix what cannot be fixed, the limits, in every possible case, of mortal sin. Casuistry may be a natural growth of the wants of conscience, and its place in a system like that of Rome is obvious. Whether it can supply those wants or not, the attempt to do so may doubtless be made with fairness and soberness; and it is impossible to doubt the ability or religious mind of many, whose meditations it has engaged. Such, in spite of Pascal, were Suarez and Vasquez. But its extent and its utility are limited; and the mischief of which it may be the occasion is obvious, if it becomes formal, or attempts to supersede or overshadow the individual conscience. And this tendency was plainly visible even in the best writers of the class. Doubtless moral questions are very important and often very hard ones. But there are endless questions on which no answer can be given except a bad one,—which cannot be answered in the shape proposed at all. We may think it very desirable to be able to state in the abstract, yet for practical use, the extreme cases, which excuse killing, or taking what is not our own; but if we cannot get beyond decisions, which leave the door open for unquestionable murders or thefts, or shut it only by vague verbal restrictions, unexplained and inexplicable, about '*prudence*,' and '*moderation*,' and '*necessity*,' and '*gravity of circumstances*,' it is a practical illustration of the difficulty of casuistry, which seems to point out, that unless we can do better,

Digitized by Google

we had best leave it alone. But these men were hard to daunt. They could not trust the consciences of mankind with principles of duty, but they could trust without a misgiving their own dialectic forms, as a calculus which nothing could resist. Nothing in the feelings or actions of men was too fleeting, too complicated, too subtle to be grasped, analysed, expressed and laid up for use, by means of the verbal technicalities of their method. No question would they dismiss as insoluble or absurd.

The consequence was twofold. Their method often *did* fail, and in the attempt to give exact formulæ of right and wrong action, they proved unable to express the right without comprehending the wrong with it. Then as it was not their way to reopen and reexamine, they were driven on that strange maxim for a practical philosophy, that much might be lawful in speculation which was unlawful in practice. They did not shrink from consequences; but they, or at least their defenders, took refuge in the alleged unfairness of taking them at their word. But it is scarcely possible to believe that this scientific impotence was the only consequence of their misdirected labour. From all evil designs the leaders, at any rate, may be safely absolved; though whether they did not lose their sense of the reality of human action, in the formal terms in which they contemplated it, may be a question. But though the *design* of corrupting morality is one of the most improbable charges against any men, the *effect* may more easily follow, even where not intended. When great authorities lay down conclusions which seem to relax the strength of obligation, man must cease to be the creature of affected self-deceit and mixed character, which we know him to be, if any verbal guarding can save them from misleading him—misleading under the pretence of obedience. These Casuists would not trust the individual conscience; and it had its revenge. They were driven onwards till they had no choice left between talking nonsense, or what was worse. They would ticket, and control, and provide for the most evanescent and mixed forms of will and feeling. They would set conscience to rights in minutest detail; and so they had to take the responsibility of whatever could not be set to rights. Nature outwitted them; it gave up its liberty in the gross, and then forced them to surrender it again in detail. They claimed to lay down exactly the measure and shape of every form of stealing; so whenever the letter of their rules did not hold there was no stealing. Nay, it made them avowedly allow for its waywardness in the rules they laid down, as the price of its submission to control at all. And thus, at length, under the treatment of compilers and abridgers, and under the influence of

Digitized by Google

that idea of authority, which deferred to *opinions*[1] on the same rule as it deferred to *testimony*,—exhibited in the coarsest brevity, and with the affectation of outbidding the boldest precedents,—grew up that form of casuistry which is exhibited in the Escobars and Baunys; which professing to be the indispensable aid to common sense, envelopes it in a very Charybdis of discordant opinions; amid whose grotesque suppositions, and whimsical distinctions, and vague yet peremptory rules, bandied about between metaphysics and real life, the mind sinks into a hopeless confusion of moral ideas, and loses every clue to simple and straightforward action.

A modern reader is more disposed to see in it mere stupid pedantry than mischief. Able and serious men of the time, on the other hand, were revolted in seeing stupid pedantry pretending to be the guide of human conduct, and showing itself off as the latest invention of modern wisdom. Doubtless both views may be exaggerated. The system may have done good in its earlier and healthier state; possibly it may also have been too antiquated and worn out to do evil in its subsequent formal overgrowth. If it is said to have been too absurd to be important, we can understand if we do not accept the view. But it is asking a hard thing to beg us to believe, as M. Maynard does, *both* that these decisions were harmless, *and* that, with a few exceptions, they were very wise; both that they had a practical use and effect, and yet were not mischievous. If it can be made out that they are *only* matter for laughing, we are quite as much inclined to laugh as to be indignant; but if we are to be serious about them, there is only one way of being so.

One point more remains to be noticed. An old writer tells us that '*cæcitatis duæ species facile concurrunt, ut qui non vident quæ sunt, videre videantur quæ non sunt.*' The remark is singularly borne out here. So convinced is M. Maynard of the evil of the Jansenist doctrine and system of direction, in exacting so much and such strict preparation for absolution and communion, and insisting so strongly on their uselessness and danger without a real change of life, *that in one way only can he account for it.*[2]

---

[1] 'Une opinion probable est celle qui a un fondement considérable. Or l'autorité d'un homme savant et pieux n'est pas de petite considération, mais plûtot de grande considération. *Car si le témoignage d'un tel homme est de grand poids pour nous assurer qu'une chose se soit passée, par exemple à Rome, pourquoi ne le sera-t-il pas de même dans un doute de morale.*'—Sanchez, quoted in Prov. V., vol. i. p. 240.

For instance, he quotes from S. Cyran,—'Pour recevoir le sacrement de l'Eucharistie, il faut être en état de grâce, avoir fait pénitence de ses péchés, et n'être pas attaché, ni par volonté ni par négligence, à aucune chose qui puisse déplaire à Dieu.' 'Ceux qui demeurent volontairement dans les moindres fautes et imperfections sont indignes du sacrement de l'Eucharistie;' with passages recommending

Digitized by Google

It is impossible, it appears to him, that men could state the claims of religion so rigorously, except for one object, *to drive men to refuse them altogether.* Accordingly, he comes to the conclusion, that Jansenius, S. Cyran, and Arnauld were *disguised infidels;* and labours to show, from a story of the time, coupled with their otherwise inexplicable severity, that Port-Royal was a deistical plot, as a Jesuit of the day expressed it, '*to ruin the* '*mystery of the Incarnation, to make the Gospel pass for an* '*apocryphal story, to exterminate the Christian religion, and to* '*raise up Deism on the ruins of Christianity.*'

Such is the only way in which M. Maynard can explain the appearance in the seventeenth century, in his own communion, of the austere language of the Fathers of the Church. And this is not a passing insinuation. As P. Brisacier assured the Jansenists that he called them 'gates of hell and pontiffs of the devil,' not '*par forme d'injure, mais par la force de la vérité;*' so M. Maynard maintains, in a special essay[1] of sixteen closely printed pages, the high historical probability of the Jansenist plot of Bourg-Fontaine, for the annihilation of Christianity. 'Si 'l'axiome de logique,' he says, '*ab actu ad posse valet illatio,* 'peut trouver ici son application, *au doit conclure qu'il est au* '*moins fort possible que le dessein de détruire le Christianisme* '*ait été pris à Bourg-Fontaine,* car les différents points qui 'l'auraient composé ont été essayés par S. Cyran et ses disciples; '*voilà qui est incontestable.*' . . . . . 'Pour conclure en un mot; '*des preuves indirectes et rétroactives semblent établir la réalité* '*du projet de Bourg-Fontaine;* des preuves péremptoires dé-'montrent que la foi de Port-Royal sur les Sacrements, sur 'l'Eucharistie, sur l'Eglise, et sur l'essence même du Chris-'tianisme, étaient au moins suspectes. Quand même ils se 'seraient trompés sur quelques points, les Jésuites n'étaient ni 'téméraires ni calomniateurs dans leurs accusations.'[2] '*Le* '*croyez-vous vous-mêmes, misérables que vous êtes?*' was Pascal's indignant challenge to his opponents then, and it is the only one worth giving at any time.

This reminds us that we have spent more time than enough on M. Maynard. Some of that famous order of which he has made himself the champion, might afford him precedents in deliberately arguing for moral paradoxes. P. Hardouin comprised Pascal in his list of Atheists. P. Raynauld proved a

---

the newly converted, or those guilty of some special sin, to abstain for a time from communion. On this M. Maynard can only put the construction, '*Traduction libre mais exacte de tous ces passages; "ne communiez jamais, car vous en êtes et en serez toujours indignes."*'—Vol. ii. pp. 219, 220.

[1] Introd. à la 16me Provinc. vol. ii. pp. 215—231.

[2] Vol. ii. pp. 218, 231.

Digitized by Google

heresy in every article of the Apostles' Creed. But, one of them, at least, probably both, did it in joke. M. Maynard has forgotten Scaliger's wise saying, *Ars est etiam maledicendi.* The most determined enemy of S. Cyran or Arnauld, who at this day affected to doubt their *Tridentine* faith about Penance and the Eucharist, would peril his character for candour; but the man who gravely pretends to maintain, and asks us to believe, that they were deliberate infidels, is far past criticism. He might as well prove that they had horns and tails.

Here we take our leave of him. Yet he has laid us under an obligation. He has realized to us—no longer, indeed, in an unsuspicious and communicative, but in an irritated mood—the Jesuit father of the Provincial Letters, a well-meaning man, and as far as possible from purposing any harm, but dulled into a positive incapacity for perceiving that there is any harm in what is wrong, if his friends say it.

But, after all, this man is but a blind and injudicious repeater, —seduced into print by that cheap gift which Frenchmen have, a plausible and flimsy rhetoric,—of the views and assertions of De Maistre,[1]—of that fashionable theory concerning the Roman Church, which itself does what is its heaviest and justest charge against opponents of that Church—prefer to call good evil, rather than submit to be checked and controlled by facts. He but follows the stream, and talks, as he can, the fearless sophistry which he hears admired. But we cannot congratulate the French Church, if he is an average specimen of the men who are promoted to her titular dignities, set over the education of her dioceses,[2] and encouraged to publish by the 'favour-'able opinion of the highest ecclesiastical authority existing in 'France.'

[1] V. De Maistre, de l'Eglise Gallicane; the parallel between Hobbes and Jansenius.

[2] 'Appelé à travailler auprès de vous à la grande œuvre de l'éducation.'—*Dedication to the Bishop of Agen.*

Digitized by Google

NOTICES.

A PRETTY edition of 'Wilson's Sacra Privata,' (Cleaver,) with ritual notes, has been published as a companion to 'Wilson on the Lord's Supper,' illustrated on a similar plan. The notes in either work are replete with learning and curious research; occasionally they give exaggerated importance to circumstances of a local and temporary character; but within the same compass it would be difficult to find more information on the order and ceremonial practice of the Church of England.

'English Alice,' by A. J. Evelyn, Esq. (Pickering,) is 'A Poem, in Five Cantos.' Mr. Evelyn assures us that in Seville of the present day the Inquisition is in full force, and hands off young English ladies to dungeons, where their joints are wrenched and racked just as in Foxe's Martyrs. We give a specimen of the poetry: Scene, the dungeons of the Inquisition: 'It'—viz. 'the judge's cold and hissing tone'—

> 'It says, "Clerk, once more ask the prisoner this,—"
> For a young secretary had his seat
> Below the judge, sleek, slim, and grimly neat,—
> "Will she confess the details of the flight," ' &c.

The intervention at the heroine's critical moment is in a high style of art, just as English Alice is about to be 'hurled' into the torture-chamber: —

> 'A lacquey enters in disorder'd haste—
> "How now?" exclaims the judge; "whence this ill-placed
> Intrusion?" "Sir, the English Consul stands
> Without, and instant liberty demands
> Of entrance."—"Then we'll go to him—remove
> The prisoner."—"Nay, most courteous judge," ' &c.

'The English Consul' is not to be taken in—he quotes Cromwell—all hearts tremble—the Inquisition collapses, and it is a satisfaction to know that

> 'Alice is free! and walks secure from harm,
> Beneath the ægis of her country's arm.'

'Gilbert Arnold' (Bentley) is a smart little book in green and gold. It appears to be an exaggerated advertisement of the Sermons preached in S. Paul's, Covent Garden.

'The Divine Master,' (Masters,) is somewhat more ambitious in language than suits our own taste; but it is a work which will doubtless attract. The sustained dialogue between the Soul and the 'Divine Master' is not, we think, the happiest, or indeed the safest, mode of conveying devotional instruction: it leads to an occasional lowering of the subject; and in the way of composition, a prolonged metaphor becomes cold. But there can be no question of the good intentions of this writer: while we may reasonably differ on the minor qualifications of style and expression.

Digitized by Google

Professor Rymer Jones has published the second volume of his delightful 'Natural History of Animals,' (Van Voorst.) The scientific merits of this work—we may say the same of the Series with which it is connected—are undoubtedly great: but what we most admire is the kind, loving, sympathising relation towards God's lower creatures which they encourage and display. Natural History so treated becomes almost a domestic history—a set of family and biographical memoirs.

From the same publisher we have received the first seven parts of a new series of the 'Instrumenta Ecclesiastica,' published under the auspices of the Ecclesiological Society. We are not sure that in practical utility this collection does not surpass its well-known predecessors. We especially select Parts IV. and V. for Colonial use: a copy of these drawings of a Wooden Church would save a Colonial diocese hundreds of pounds, and a greater consumption of failure and disappointment. The series is executed with great delicacy; and not only with a firm grasp of the ancient spirit of design, but with as clear a view of the necessity of adapting old forms and feeling to modern requirements. If 'Ecclesiology' were once, and, perhaps, not altogether unjustly, charged with pedantry, it is a satisfaction to find its later developments so eminently practical. Indeed, the mere archæological merits of this series are among their least important recommendations.

While we are chronicling second volumes and continuations, we desire to record 'The Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen,' (Pickering,) of which we spoke favourably on the appearance of the first volume. We repeat this commendation to its successor.

We do not go to the extent of acquiescing in all Mr. Charles Smith's 'Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome,' (J. W. Parker,) of which the third part has just appeared, 'on the Mass and Transubstantiation.' But we must say that the series is full of thought, and embodies a deep and full appreciation of the mysteries of the Christian kingdom. Mr. Smith seems to represent, or to recal, the school of H. More and his Cambridge followers. We cannot think the study of the subject complete without reference to these able and original publications.

Mr. Dowell's 'Catechism on the Services of the Church of England,' (Rivingtons,) is full, and laborious, and sound.

Mr. Murray's cheap series, 'Railway Reading,' has received many pleasant instalments. Lady Eastlake's 'Music and Dress;' pleasant at the close of the London season. 'The Honey Bee;' quite a summer book, and to be read with summer accompaniments. 'The Flower Garden;' equally seasonable. 'Oliphant's Journey to Nepaul;' one of the very best of the series, and one which will serve to show holiday travellers what in the great unexplored East still awaits them. To commend again what everybody commends, is tedious, if necessary.

'The Jubilee Year of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,' (Bell,) has, and very successfully, reached its second edition, enriched with the contributors' names. It is a graceful memorial of a memorable occasion.

'Outlines of Ecclesiastical History,' (J. W. Parker,) by Mr. W. H. Hoare. In small manuals of this kind, verbal and minute accuracy is everything.

We regret that Mr. Hoare has not superintended the press. At p. 19 we read of 'Praxeas, Nætus, and Beryllus,'—at p. 54 we find Nestorius advanced before the Catholic Church, and the 'Eutycheans' enjoying the same preference. This work is founded a good deal on Dean Waddington's Ecclesiastical History.

Mr. Pott's 'Confirmation Lectures, preached at Cuddesden,' (Masters,) are above the average.

'Oremus,' (Rivingtons,) we fear, is a collection below the average even of religious verses.

M. Cely Trevilian, Esq.—is the second name the archaic form of *silly?*—has, in his 'Examination of the sign χξϛ, Rev. xiii. 18,' (Binns and Goodwin,) discovered the Beast of the Apocalypse in Louis Napoleon. 666, we are assured, means 6,000,000; but the President was elected by six millions; therefore the President is the Beast. Q.E.D. Not content with this notable discovery, Mr. Trevilian goes further: in a very tantalizing way, after having so satisfactorily disposed of χξϛ, he assures us that after all the sign is not χξϛ but ξιϛ = 60. 10. 6., which looks very like 76. But this would not suit Mr. Trevilian, who wanted to juggle 1066 out of it, which, by some cabalistical process, he says means Louis Napoleon. But how to get 1066 out of 60. 10. 6.? Why, says Mr. Trevilian, by making the middle figure the most important; just as over 'a shop door, you read *Silversmith* Payne *Jeweller*,' p. 17. Actually all this is in print; and as a clincher to the argument, the prominence given to the figure 10 signifies the 10 May. We commit arithmetic and numerical signs to Mr. Trevilian: the truths of numbers can avenge themselves: to be told that six hundred is only a form of six millions requires no reprobation. But why should Mr. Trevilian play cabalistical tricks with grammar and the doctrine of gender: cannot he leave the poor Graces alone? why does he talk of (p. 27):—

'Vultus non omnibus una?'

We can hardly keep pace with the publications which multiply upon us, upon the engrossing question of Synodical action, and the admission of the lay element into Church assemblies; that both these subjects may be discussed with temper and judgment, is our sincere wish. But since at the present moment even the expression of opinion has its dangers, we content ourselves with announcing, 1, 'Synodal Action necessary to the Church:' a letter to Mr. Gladstone, by Mr. Caswall, (Mozley.) 2. 'Suggestions for practically carrying out the Principle of Lay Cooperation in the Synods of the Scottish Church,' (Aberdeen: Brown.) 3. 'The Law, Constitution, and Reform of Convocation,' (J. H. Parker.) 4. 'Some Objections to the Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods answered, by Mr. G. D. Wheeler,' in a University Sermon, (J. H. Parker.) 5. 'Church Synods the Institution of Christ,' a Sermon preached in York Minster, by Mr. George Trevor, (Bell.) 6. Archdeacon Sinclair's 'Charge' (Rivingtons,) against Synodal action. 7. 'The Appeal to Convocation:' Archdeacon Wilberforce's Charge, (Murray.)

Mr. W. R. Scott, a name new to us, has printed a very promising pamphlet, 'A reply to Mr. Goode,' (Masters,) on the necessity of the Episcopal question. Archdeacon Churton and Mr. Harington have left something yet to glean in this field of discussion; and Mr. W. B. Flower, in his 'Non-Episcopal Orders: a Letter to Mr. Goode,' (Masters,) on the same subject, has completed the discussion with vigour and freeness. Mr. Goode,

Digitized by Google

nothing daunted, and always ready to pick a quarrel with everybody, and to take for a personality every hint at heterodoxy, advertises a 'Letter to Sir W. P. Wood, on the acceptance of the Prayer Book in a non-natural sense.' The assertion was general enough: has Mr. Goode his especial reasons for making the taunt a personal one?

To Mr. Jebb we are indebted for an earnest 'Plea for what is left of the Cathedrals, &c.' (Rivingtons.) It was directly called out by Lord Blandford's Bill: but the occasion or the necessity for some such protest has not passed away. The fate of capitular corporations is curious enough. When, ten or twenty years ago, Church Reform was the order of the day, Churchmen saw that the only hope for the Chapters was in making them useful. This purpose has been defeated from that day to this by those who are now most clamorous against Cathedrals. If it was the policy of the Whigs to destroy Cathedrals and stalls by filling them with unworthy incumbents, they have gone far to succeed.

'What are the best Means of Reclaiming our lost Population?' (Leeds: Harrison,) is the authoritative Report of Suggestions made by the Leeds Clergy on the division of services, and other practical measures, which, when first made, attracted much attention, and, in some not unnecessary particulars, much criticism.

'Specimens of Old Indian Poetry,' translated from the Sanskrit, by Mr. Griffith, Boden Scholar, (Hall, Virtue & Co.) is the work of one who is a perfect master of metre and language. If, as we have no reason to doubt, its fidelity is equal to its force and English style, we may pronounce Mr. Griffith's 'Specimens' a distinct and important contribution to English literature.

'The Emphatic New Testament,' by Mr. John Taylor, (Taylor, Walton & Co.) is an attempt to mark the emphasis and relative value of each word by a system of corresponding differences in type. Practically this amounts to a kind of pictorial commentary; since it is obvious that interpretation turns on emphasis. In proportion to the skill displayed in the execution of this task—and we are not disparaging the pains bestowed on it—are the controversial difficulties which it involves. The obvious objection to the principle of such a work is, that it confines the sense to a single emphasis;—*ex. grat.* The Lord's Prayer: everybody feels that one of the blessings belonging to this prayer is the variety and succession of emphases—that is, of successive and parallel senses and applications of which it admits. Mr. Taylor's attempt, of course, practically excludes all meanings but one.

Perhaps the most important book of the quarter is Mr. Cleveland Coxe's 'Sympathies of the Continent, or Proposals for a New Reformation,' (J. H. Parker.) The body of this work consists of a translation of Hirscher's 'Present Crisis of the Church,' with parallel illustrations from contemporaneous French and Italian works. Dr. Hirscher is a Roman Catholic, a dignitary of Freiburg, Breisgau, and a writer of large and European reputation. His proposition is for another Reformation: he goes very deeply into the practical necessities of the Church, especially those arising from its separation from the State. But we may perhaps state the drift of the work best in its author's own words: 'A third point to which the Church 'must direct its immediate attention, is the satisfaction of that general

Digitized by Google

'desire, which is prevalent, for certain reforms. This desire is of long 'standing, and very familiar to us. What is wanted is, for example, an 'improvement in the worship of the Church; a revision of its liturgical 'formularies; the translation of the Liturgy into the vulgar tongue; com- 'munion in both kinds; the reform of the confessional; the simplification 'of ceremonies, and such like changes. So too we need an amelioration 'of the ecclesiastical discipline; the abolition of the forced celibacy of 'priests; and the revision of certain ecclesiastical obligations. We need 'further improvements, for example, in the Table of Lessons, and a greater 'variety in the selections from the Gospels and Epistles. We need eman- 'cipation from that tyranny which imposes upon the faithful, as Catholic 'doctrine, matters which have never been settled by the Church. Finally, 'we require reforms in the constitution of the Church; the revival of 'Synodal institutions; and the proportionate participation of Clergy and 'Laity in the affairs of the Church.'—Pp. 180—182.

To these points Dr. Hirscher subsequently adds, p. 209, masses for the dead; p. 211, indulgences; p. 216, abuses connected with confraternities and special devotions; p. 220, the *cultus* of the saints, &c. These are the practical matters which one so distinguished in the German Church feels bound to call attention to: these abuses, he says, must be remedied; must be remedied in Synod; and in this Synod Laymen must have a voice. But why does the present time so imperatively call for this reform? Because the Church is thrown on its own resources: the Church must develop its own life: the State when connected exercised a reforming influence; that being withdrawn, the Church must supply its own corrective tendencies; especially must the laity discharge, in the Church and for the Church, those functions which hitherto the State performed *ab extra*. Thus, according to Dr. Hirscher, it seems that the new development of lay influence depends upon the separation of the Church from the State. In these views Dr. Hirscher is by no means singular: it is known that he represents a large class. Lately the German Bishops in Synod all but arrived at some reforming resolution. In France—in Italy—even in South America, the same spirit is at work. These are certainly signs of a reformation of Romanism from within, and of a direct upheaving of the spiritual life of the Church by its own power: as such they deserve the utmost attention from ourselves. And the striking similarity of the circumstances with our own, on such subjects as clerical education, schools, and the voluntary offerings of the people, towards which Dr. Hirscher directs his especial attention, makes this work very applicable to ourselves. There is hardly one of the subjects of the day mooted among ourselves which is not illustrated by Dr. Hirscher. We commend this volume to general and immediate attention.

In a long and able Introduction, Mr. Coxe draws out the general and diffused 'Sympathies of the Continent' in the reforming direction; and he takes occasion to clear away some objections and misunderstandings connected with his own—the American—Church. We select a passage which sufficiently indicates the spirit in which Mr. Coxe has treated his subject:—

'"If ever Christians re-unite, as all things make it their interest to do, it 'would seem that the movement must take its rise in the Church of Eng- 'land. . . . . She is most precious, and may be considered as one of those

'chemical *intermèdes*, which are capable of producing a union between 'elements dissociable in themselves." So wrote the Count de Maistre, a 'close observer of the Continental Protestants, and of the Russo-Greek 'Church; but one of the most bigoted Ultramontanists that ever strove to 'make the worse appear the better reason in behalf of Rome! Perhaps he 'said it "not of himself." It was written before the present century 'opened, and what sign of such a *movement* existed then? But now, when 'we find "deep calling unto deep"—religious movement characterising the 'whole Church; and all that is not unreal and re-actionary, setting towards 'one result, it becomes England and English Christians to recognise this 'noble mission of their Church. Is not the *movement* which now agitates 'her, the expected beginning of better things for the world? It is certainly 'a Catholic movement in its spirit and tendencies, and coincides with that 'which has been already characterised, as it exists in Hirscher. It sets 'not towards Rome; but, far beyond Rome and Mediævalism, it seeks 'after the primitive and the pure. So far from being papal, it is, in a good 'sense, popular. While Mediævalism runs counter to all the habits and 'principles of the English race, wherever it is found, this movement, like 'Hirscher's, seeks to meet the wants and instincts of men in society, and 'to adapt itself to the condition of the world. Instead of isolating the 'priesthood, and keeping the laity at a distance, it breathes the genuine 'spirit of ancient Catholicity, in its philanthropy, its sympathy for the 'masses, and its desire to employ the mighty energies of the people in 'honourable services and holy undertakings. With all its divine right and 'high conservatism, it yet understands the popular element, and knows 'how to produce harmonious action between it, and what is exclusively 'sacerdotal. It is impossible that this movement should not be highly 'popular with Englishmen, when once it is purified from the obloquy and 'the defilement which have befallen it, through the morbid enthusiasm of 'some who have shared its earliest and most dangerous excitements.'—Pp. 48—50.

'The Eclipse of Faith,' (Longman,) is a very remarkable book. It is a reply—and an adequate reply—to Mr. Francis Newman's recent 'Phases of Faith:' and to the mysticism of the new school of spiritualizing infidelity. The argument is conducted with great skill, it combines the true Socratic irony with the Socratic dialogue. There is wit, too, as well as wisdom in the discussion: and though the writer—Mr. Rogers, of the 'Edinburgh Review'—holds views different on many important matters from our own, we must award him the honour of a distinguished defence of revelation in the present work—a work in which depth of thought is relieved by great clearness and force of style.

We sympathise with the purpose of the series of Tracts proposed on 'The Restoration of Belief,' (Cambridge: Macmillan,) and, as far as the first number brings them out, with the immediate objects and method of their writers. But we cannot reconcile ourselves to a more decisive commendation of what is necessarily, at present, so undeveloped.

'Evenings at Sackville College,' (Masters,) announces its character. It is a collection of 'Legends for Children.' To this there would be no objection were all the narratives simply fictitious, but they lay claim to various degrees of credibility: and the last, 'by way of contrast,' is the Bedminster

Coal-pit accident. It is unquestionably true that the writer gives notice that he does not demand the same amount or character of belief to all his narratives: but it argues more critical powers than children have, or ought to have, when we expect them to distinguish between this fact, a few months old, and the story of 'S. Sebaldus and the Icicles.' We may tell a child that legends are not true: but to read them from the *Times* newspaper would be somewhat perplexing.

We have only just received the same active writer's 'Lectures on Church Difficulties,' (Masters.) We have, however, seen enough of them to pronounce them both lively and vigorous, and, as far as we have read, entirely sound disquisitions on the 'subjects of the day.' They are written in a free flowing way; with terse and apt illustration: and if they occasionally verge on the familiar, it must be remembered that few or none were delivered in public. The disquisition on Sermons struck us forcibly.

Mr. Johns' 'History of Spain, for Children,' (Masters,) perhaps not improperly, lays no claim to historical criticism. We have the old stories of Count Julian and Don Roderick, and of the Cid, which are probably as true as those of Tarpeia and Curtius. However, it is all pleasant enough to read: and we would not deprive children of their sweets. Niebuhrism has made history dull work for young folks.

Miss Fourdrinier's 'Our New Parish,' (Pickering,) without having a very ambitious aim, hits its mark: and to say this is considerable praise. The plan of this little work is to illustrate the first of each of the Church Services celebrated in a new church by some appropriate tale: the stories have point and are carefully written. But their length often outweighs the incidents. The Church and its appointments; its once a month Communions, and apparently its once a week prayers, demanded and have produced a level, and perhaps common-place series of annals. Under better circumstances the authoress had very likely produced a better work.

To those, and we believe they are many, who admire the 'Tales of Kirkbeck,' another volume, 'Our Doctor,' &c. (Masters,) will be an agreeable present. It is equal to its predecessors: and if we do not pronounce a glowing eulogium, it is because, as we have often said, this class of fictions directly religious is not to our taste. We have never yet reconciled either our theological or literary sympathies with them. The writer is very prolific—too much so, we think, for a lasting reputation. Another story, 'a domestic tale,' is announced from the same hand. The substance of our distaste to this class of books is summed up well enough in a passage which we have lighted upon in a remarkable work, which we have not read, but which we intend to read, 'Reminiscences of Thought and Feeling.' 'George the Fourth's Queen Caroline,' and we own to be astounded at our ally, 'observed in her broken English when somebody 'offered her a religious novel, and which she declined to peruse,—"If I 'have no-velle, let me have no-velle, and if I have ser-mons, let me have 'ser-mone, but don't let me have both at once;" and there was great 'justice, as well as shrewdness, in the remark.'

Messrs. Davies and Vaughan, Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, have printed a 'Translation of Plato's Republic,' (Macmillan.) Under such antecedents, it is almost superfluous to announce a sound and scholarly version. It is more: it is, and a rare virtue in classical transla-

Digitized by Google

tions, 'done into choice English.' Besides this, it has a sensible introduction, and a close analysis. The translations of the interspersed hexameters are cleverly rendered in the corresponding metre.

Archdeacon Wilberforce's Charge, 'The Appeal to Convocation,' (Mozleys,)—we have previously alluded to its reference to Convocation and the question of Synods—contains some reflections on practical matters which are important. On Church-rates he takes, we think, a sensible line:—

'None of us, probably, will deny, however strange it may appear to ourselves, that there may be persons who are sincerely opposed to the Church to which reason and habit has attached us. But whatever sentiments may have prevailed at other times, or in other countries, it is to be hoped that there are few Englishmen in the nineteenth century who would wish to coerce the consciences of others. It follows that, whatever be the religious opinions of our fellow-countrymen, they must be allowed to enjoy the protection of those equal laws which secure our persons and property. Now, it may be questioned how far this is consistent with the practice of calling upon men to take an active part in maintenance of a faith which they believe to be erroneous. It is true, of course, that those who purchase a property have no right to complain of the deductions to which they know it to be incident: if a man buys only 9-10ths of an estate, he has only 9-10ths of it. But this merely implies that the Church has a right to such payments as depend upon the active support of former benefactors; it does not fully meet the question of church-rates, as levied in the present day. The ancient law requires all persons who occupy houses or lands to assemble and to tax themselves for the maintenance of their parish church, and for the expenses of public worship. Now, it is one thing that these objects should be defrayed at the public expense; and another, that every individual should be called upon, by his own vote, to affirm their propriety. Even dissenters might think it desirable that a church should be provided for the poor, though they do not themselves frequent it, and Churchmen, on the other hand, might claim to retain rights which had been once conceded to them, without choosing to appeal to the liberality of Separatists. But the peculiarity of a church-rate is this—that, though imposed by the general law of the land, it yet requires the personal cooperation of every individual. Various members of Parliament have lately declared that they will give no vote for bestowing any additional grant on the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth, but that they feel reluctant to touch existing endowments. Here you see the principle out of which the cry against church-rates has arisen. If churches were endowed with a certain sum for their sustentation, or if they had in any way a claim upon the public purse, there would be no appearance of an individual grievance; but you call all dwellers in the parish together, you require them to levy a tax upon themselves for the maintenance of the fabric, and the supply of the sacramental elements, though they are allowed to deny the utility of public worship, and the validity of sacraments. And if it be asked how this anomaly has arisen, the answer is the same as before. The objector can hardly wonder that the ecclesiastical laws make no allowance for his opinions, since they take no note of his existence. To make rates, and to be eligible as Churchwardens, are correlative facts; the same circumstance which entitles a

'man to the last exposes him to the former. If the one be a grievance to 'the Dissenter, so is the other to the Clergy. Both arise from the fact 'that the ecclesiastical laws assume that no one is allowed to live in this 'country who is not a member of the National Church; so that they can 'neither make allowance for the difficulties of the Dissenter, nor guard 'against his intrusion. And are not all persons interested in getting rid of 'such a system of fictions as this? If it is inconvenient to the Dissenter, 'is it not ten times more prejudicial to the Church, which an antiquated 'system of law obstructs at every turn? Are our spiritual courts to go on 'for ever, like the seven sleepers, assuming that the coinage of James I. is 'still the current money of the realm?'—Pp. 17—19.

His observations on the vexed question of the lay element are also of value:—

'A third point of delicacy and importance will have to be considered—the 'expediency of reinforcing Convocation by a house of lay representatives. 'That such a thing will be done can hardly be doubted, nor will I deny that it 'ought to be done. But it will be of paramount moment not to forget the 'great truth that the Church is a divine, not a human institution—that its 'principle of guidance is not natural reason, but divine grace: and, there- 'fore, that it makes its appeal not to the common sense of mankind, but to 'the constituted depositories of the faith. The Church was founded by our 'Lord himself in His holy apostles; it discharges its trust through the 'ministration of those offices which are dependent upon the gift of orders, 'so that the custody of doctrine was of necessity lodged in the same hands 'to which the function of government was committed. The guardianship 'of the ancient faith was always understood, therefore, to lie in the College 'of Apostles and in the collective body of their successors the Bishops, to 'whom was committed the awful function of representing the Divine 'Founder of the Church. Such was the necessary effect of entrusting the 'gift of orders, and, therefore, the administration of sacraments, to their 'keeping; and such was the rule which was practically observed in the 'ancient Church. The admission of the second order of ministers to a part 'of this responsibility has resulted, not wholly without precedent, from the 'circumstances in which the bishops of our two provinces have been placed 'by their isolation from the rest of Christendom. But it can never be 'allowable to reverse the principles of a divine institution, and to substitute 'the law of nature for that of grace. It must not be forgotten, therefore, 'that the custody of doctrine lies in those who have a spiritual commission '—that it pertains to them by virtue of that original character, which the 'Divine Head impressed upon his Church—that His promise of guidance 'belongs, in its plenitude, not to individuals, but to the collective body— 'that it pertains to individuals, only while they retain their place in that 'whole, in which they are members; and, therefore, that no change can be 'admissible, which would break in upon the fundamental law, that Christ's 'Church is a spiritual kingdom founded in His holy Apostles.

'If this principle can only be maintained inviolate, great advantages 'may follow from associating the lay representatives of our communicants 'with the Convocation of the clergy. It is obvious how great would be its 'effect in the attainment of practical reforms. But that which is of the 'highest importance, is that nothing would so surely disabuse the public 'mind of the erroneous impression that Parliament represents the English

Digitized by Google

'Church. The error is not an unnatural one, considering that the changes 'in the aspect of our political heavens have been as gradual as they have 'complete. At present, however, Parliament expresses the minds of nearly '30 millions of our fellow-countrymen, of whom not above a third are 'nominally members of our Church. How, then, can it stand in the same 'relation to us as when none could be a voter or a legislator who was not 'a communicant? But this will never be practically felt till a body exists 'which occupies the same place which was once occupied by Parliament. 'Neither can it be any sacrifice of principle that the lay representatives of 'our communicants should concur in public measures so long as they are 'ready to admit—as Parliament formerly did—that if "any cause of the 'law divine happened to come in question," or of spiritual learning, it 'ought to be "declared interpreted, and showed, by that part of the body 'politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English 'Church."' [1]—Pp. 21—23.

And also on the general subject of our changing relations to Parliament:—

'It is obvious enough how this has happened, and how injurious is its 'effect, both to the clergy and the Church. We have two sets of laws—'one civil, the other ecclesiastical; one created by Parliament, the other by 'Convocation. The principle of our civil laws has been entirely changed 'during the last two centuries. First came the Toleration Act, in 1688; 'then the Union with Scotland, in 1706; lastly, the repeal of the Test Act, 'in 1828, and that of Roman Catholic Disabilities, in 1829. The effect of 'these alterations has been not only to give the most perfect legal toleration 'to men of all opinions, but to cut asunder the relations by which the 'Church was formerly bound to the ruling power of this realm. This is the 'necessary result, whether good or evil, of giving power to the mass of the 'people, while the people are divided in religious opinions. But, while this 'change has been going on in our civil laws, our ecclesiastical laws have 'remained wholly unaltered. They continue to take it for granted that the 'constitution of this country does not allow any person to be an English-'man who is not also a Churchman. They make no provision for any other 'case. They deal with the clergy as though this were truly the state of 'things. And hence results a mass of fictions and anomalies, injurious in 'many ways to all parties; but by which the Church herself is incomparably 'the greatest sufferer. Her own formularies declare the due use of eccle-'siastical discipline to be a criterion of a true Church. And why, then, is 'it abandoned? Because to acknowledge changes which it was impossible 'to avoid, is thought a greater evil than to retain laws, which it is impos-'sible to execute. The Court, at which we are at present assembled, is 'held for the professed purpose of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline. Now, 'there are two principles on which it might be grounded. When the State 'and the Church are identical, as they were in England in the reign of

[1] 'Should a house of lay-representatives ever be united to Convocation, there are two rules which must be laid down as fundamental principles of their incorporation, unless we are prepared to give up our claim to be a part of the ancient Church Catholic: first, that all questions which involve doctrine should be decided by the Spirituality; secondly, that it should belong to the Spirituality to determine what questions do, and what do not, involve doctrine. This would leave to the laity that secular part of ecclesiastical affairs, which our ancient constitution assigned to Parliament.'

'Elizabeth, Church discipline can be enforced by temporal penalties. When 'the State and the Church are not identical, as before the time of Constan-'tine, it can only be maintained by allowing the Church to act as an inde-'pendent corporation, and to exercise authority over her own voluntary 'members. But the Church of England can neither adopt the one principle 'nor the other. She cannot act as a voluntary corporation, because her 'laws assume that she is identical with the State. She cannot employ the 'principle of coercion, because she is not really identical with it. So that 'she has the incumbrances of State succour without its benefits; her 'responsibilities are measured by one rule, her jurisdiction by another.

'That the evil referred to is not a visionary one is shown by the wide 'dissatisfaction recently manifested among the clergy. In a Letter of the '13th February, 1852, the Archbishop of Canterbury says that he has lately 'communicated "to a large assembly of bishops, the memorial respecting 'the burial service, signed by 4,000 clergy. The bishops," he adds, "gene-'rally sympathise with the memorialists in the difficulties to which they 'sometimes find themselves exposed with reference to the terms of that 'service. But I am sorry to report further," he concludes, "that the 'obstacles in the way of remedying those difficulties, appear to them, as at 'present advised, to be insuperable." Now, it is obvious, as his Grace 'says, that the difficulty cannot be remedied by any act of their lordships, 'however deeply they may feel the hardships which it frequently inflicts. 'And cases have occurred in this Riding, as well as elsewhere, which would 'sufficiently exhibit it. For there can be no cure so long as we keep up 'a law which is adapted, like the 68th canon, to a state of circumstances 'which no longer exists. This canon was passed two centuries and a half 'ago, when no such thing as dissent was tolerated in England. The state 'of our civil law at that period may be understood from the fact, that four 'years after it had been enacted, Whiteman was burned at Lichfield, and 'Legate at Smithfield, for denying the Trinity. Can we wonder that the 'rules which had their origin in such a system of law, are inapplicable to our 'present position? Would our militia fight with advantage if they were 'restricted from the employment of every weapon which has come into use 'since the invention of gunpowder? Yet this rule was passed by Convo-'cation, and by Convocation only can it be amended. It touches upon 'spiritual questions, with which no other body in the country is competent 'to deal. For it can hardly be thought decent that the internal affairs 'of the Church should be discussed by the Roman Catholic or dissenting 'members of Parliament. So that either we must appeal to the Church's 'assembly, or we must continue under the grievances and anomalies from 'which it has power to relieve us.'—Pp. 14—16.

Of Sermons we have to put on record, 1. 'The Temptation of our Blessed Lord; a series of Lectures by Mr. T. Tunstall Smith,' (Hatchard.) 2. 'Life and Death;' some affecting Discourses by Mr. C. C. Spencer, (Cleaver.) 3. 'Sermons, addressed to a Country Congregation;' carefully prepared for their specialties by Mr. E. T. Codd, (Masters.) 4. 'The Revelations of Astronomy; by Mr. Steel, preached at Harrow School,' (J. W. Parker.) 5. 'Our Founder's Claim; preached on S. Barnabas' Day, at S. Barnabas, Pimlico, by Mr. Skinner,' (Hayes,) which contains a recognition, neither tardy nor grudging, of Mr. Bennett's zeal and successes.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1852.

ART. I.—1. *A Voyage to Iceland. By* MADAME IDA PFEIFFER. London: Bentley.

2. *A Woman's Journey Round the World.* Illustrated London Library.

IT is not possible to read many books of travels, without falling into a course of reflection on the various qualities necessary to make a good traveller, which mankind in general are without, or possess in a very limited degree; and if our cogitations are pursued far enough, arriving at the conclusion, that many of these qualities are of an order and strength so different from what are needed by stayers at home, that we must consider travelling a providential calling, inasmuch as these gifts would be nothing short of a hindrance and a snare if not allowed their appropriate exercise. The powers and faculties which constitute an efficient traveller might, from misdirection, be wearying, or even repelling in our home friends and intimate acquaintance. There is so manifest a fitness between the man and his work, that we can wish him no other destiny, nor ourselves a closer familiarity. The more he is suited for his vocation, the less we desire to see him in any other. In fact, the man whose home is the world, has no other home, either in visible space, or in the heart of man.

To review some of these qualities. Unflagging energy is noble, but often a snare to its possessor without a wide enough field for its exertions; ceaseless curiosity, a praiseworthy instinct so long as there are objects worthy to engage it; health, courage and endurance are excellent gifts if not brought into ostentatious comparison with feebler powers; indifference to personal ease and the conveniences of life, respectable, unless they make some domestic hearth uncomfortable. Again; toleration of the world's variety of habits and customs is amiable if it does not jar with the stricter rules of an organized society, and an expansive feeling of

Digitized by Google

benevolence fills us with admiration, till we are made alive to its tendency to check strong individual attachments. It is needless to pursue the catalogue of wayfaring virtues which, in any disproportionate development, point out some of our fellows, either as pioneers of civilization leading their less adventurous brothers to fresh fields and pastures new; or as links to draw together, for the benefit of all, nations and people whom prejudice and restrictions have hitherto held apart; or simply as faithful portrayers of those wonders and beauties of God's creation from which we are furthest removed, and to which personal access is denied us. And here the points of similarity, amid the essential differences of their avocations, suggest an analogy between the office of the traveller and the poet, so far as they are teachers and benefactors of their race. Both are sustained and led on by an irresistible impulse: the poet must speak or die; the man who thirsts to know and see all this earth has to show, alike feels it the end and purpose of his existence, and holds life itself well spent in the search.

> 'I cannot rest from travel, I will drink
> Life to the lees. * *
> For my purpose holds
> To sail beyond the sunset and the baths
> Of all the western stars until I die.
> It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
> It may be we shall touch the happy isles.'

Both have for their object the vast field of man and nature, and are absorbed by these interests to the exclusion or neglect of personal and private ones. To each they must be the main pursuit of life; and both are separated by peculiar gifts and powers for their work. But here start the innumerable points of difference: for first, Imagination, all essential to the poet, the one indispensable gift, is so far from a necessity to the traveller, that the possession of it would at once check his own progress, and weaken our trust in him. If he could vividly picture the unseen to his mind, the passion for seeing with the actual vision would lose its intensity; if we could detect in him a free play of fancy, we should mistrust his reports to us.

> 'The light that never was by sea or land'

should not and does not illuminate his landscape. It is his merit, as it is his nature, to see things precisely as they are. No prejudices must warp his judgment, no associations interfere with the duty of impartial comparison. The poet is nobly prejudiced; his country, his birth-place, his home have an inalienable claim on his best love and warmest admiration; their characteristics influence all his ideas of beauty. The traveller's

Digitized by Google

unchartered freedom leaves him always at liberty to weigh and compare, to give up all he has seen for what he may see, to yield the palm to the new, over the most cherished past scene. And so far as he betrays a preference to his own country, as such, over any other that he visits, because it is his own, he loses his right to our confidence; or of his country's customs, as such, to others, which the course of his wanderings brings him amongst, we have to withdraw our implicit faith. But we yield ourselves up to the poet to be taught by him, to admire what he admires, to love what he loves, to be influenced by his prejudices, to share his associations. For we know that Nature waits upon him, that she reveals to him her secrets, that he possesses the key of her deepest meanings and most hidden sympathies, and therefore, though he has seen but one corner of her illimitable field, one grain of her great harvest, we feel that he is yet possessed of a higher truth concerning all, than our mere senses can attain to: and thus aided, easily, because with congenial labour, he gains his knowledge, while the traveller toils in the sweat of his brow, and in toiling, though he sees great things, loses the delicacy of his perceptions, and impairs the fineness of his instincts.

Their uses to ourselves too are different. The one sets before us as plainly and accurately as he can whatever is prominent, distinguished, or wonderful in the world,—all that most readily attracts attention, and takes the most forcible hold on the memory, and which, being remote, or at least beyond our reach, can only be known through his report. The use of the poet, on the contrary, is to awaken our too readily dulled perceptions to the beauty which lies around us in simple forms and most familiar combinations; which we are in danger of disregarding, because they are always before us, but which are the depositories —whether we search into them or not—of all our purest associations, as being the source of those first thoughts of wonder, love, and admiration that visited our childhood. He puts us in a frame to recal these recollections; he connects our past and present, and thus dignifies and exalts both; and through him the sweet sounds that greet us every day, instead of falling on deaf ears, are to us the 'music of Paradise, for the heart listens;' the fields that our eyes have rested on since they had power to rejoice in the sunshine, can excite in us moments of more intense emotion than all the magnificence of unfamiliar scenes, till for us too

> 'Tears from the depth of some divine despair
> Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,
> In looking on the happy autumn fields,
> And thinking of the days that are no more.'

Digitized by Google

The instinct of travelling is opposed to all this. A large-hearted man, though spending his life in an eager search for the new and wonderful, can, perhaps, by an effort, bring himself to some comprehension of a state of feeling so contrary to his individual experience; but the traveller *per se* has rather a contempt for such misplaced enthusiasm, and is prone to think it a narrow home-bound weakness. Who can weep over a corn-field with its waving gold, and its band of reapers, who has witnessed nature in her greater works of terror, glory and beauty, her towering rocks, her endless forests, her illimitable plains, and sunset amongst the mountains? To borrow an illustration from the work before us:—All the world has been struck and moved by the true patriotism of the Holsteiners—by the heroic efforts and sacrifices that as a nation they have made for their country and its independence. It is truly delightful to find that this noble enthusiasm extends to the very soil of their native land,—that its very simple and homely beauties have charms for them beyond the splendours of all other countries,—that they see it in the bright hues of love, not in a spirit of cold comparison. But our traveller can feel none of this; so we find in her simply a contemptuous surprise:—

'No other object worthy of note is seen, but a monastery, where several Dukes of Holstein are buried, and a few insignificant lakes, such as Bernsholmer, Einfelder, and Schulhofer. I should have overlooked entirely a little stream called the Eider, had not some of my fellow-passengers laid great stress upon its beauties. I have never found among the inhabitants of the most celebrated countries more enthusiasm for what was truly grand and wonderful, than this people appeared to feel for nothing at all. One very respectable woman in particular, my neighbour during the journey, was indefatigable in her praises of her Fatherland; to her the dwarfish woods seemed a magnificent park, and the vacant flat was a boundless prospect, over which her delighted eyes were never tired of wandering. I silently wished her joy of this powerful imagination, but could not breathe any of her animation into my own cold feelings.'—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 29.

Again, in her visit to the Vatne, the Elysium of Iceland. The Icelanders are said, happily for them, to possess a passionate love for their country, which enables them to endure evils which we should think insupportable. They have scenes of desolate grandeur enough, but a lake sleeping in a green meadow is a rarity; it furnishes them with ideas, which would otherwise be lost to them, of serenity and repose, and connects them too with that distant more genial world which they read of. No wonder, then, that they make much of it, that they love it for all that it suggests, as well as for what it is. But Madame Pfeiffer had seen many a fairer lake, so she cannot even attempt to feel with them:—

Digitized by Google

'In half an hour we reached a valley, in the centre of which lay rather a pleasant meadow, with what might be considered in Iceland a very respectable farm-house, near a little lake. I did not venture to ask if this were the celebrated Vatne, and the romantic prospect I had been led to expect, for my inquiring would have sounded rather too ironical; and notwithstanding my astonishment when Mr. Von H—— insisted on all the charms of the scene, I enthusiastically agreed with him, and declared I had never seen a lovelier view, or a larger lake. We halted at this spot, and while the rest of the party spread themselves over the meadow, and preparations were going on for our sociable meal, I employed the time by endeavouring to satisfy my spirit of inquiry.'—P. 103.

But it is not fair to our authoress to dwell first upon what she is not, when there is so much to tell of what she is. Madame Ida Pfeiffer is a traveller in the fullest sense of the word. All the natural qualities which point men out for this vocation she has in such a preeminent degree, that we scarcely regret her total deficiency in many of the acquired ones. It only shows the more forcibly the strength of the original bias and the power of that irresistible impulse which leads some men, through any sacrifice and danger, to see for themselves, and to describe to others their own impressions and adventures. Her well-known work,—'A Woman's Journey Round the World,' though detailing events subsequent to those which form the subject of our article, has yet been so much longer before the English reader, that the period has passed for any lengthened notice; nor indeed was it necessary to call attention to a book so full of interest, and that of so very popular a character. But we must dwell for a moment on some of the leading traits of character which this volume brings to light. We have hitherto been accustomed to consider women incapable of the extremes of fatigue and bodily exertion. There are a number of feats of travel which it is supposed impossible for a woman to perform; which she has neither strength, nor courage, nor inclination for. The attractions at once, and the infirmities of her sex, seem to point her out rather to fulfil the part of Desdemona than Othello,—to drink in tales about the Anthropophagi, rather than to go in search of them. But Madame Pfeiffer is of another mind altogether, and as far as her individual example goes, has proved the utter fallacy of these suppositions. Inspired by one absorbing passion, there is nothing that she hears a report of but she longs to know it more fully, and no adventure that she undertakes that she has not sense and spirit to carry through. Her energy is not one step behind her curiosity. She has shown that she deliberately holds any new country, any natural wonder, well worth the risk of dying to see; and has proved at the same time that with such a temper of mind, her sex instead of a hindrance is a help, that—(though we are far from wishing the experiment repeated)—women are in a certain sense better

Digitized by Google

fitted to penetrate into new scenes than men. They excite less suspicion and a gentler and more amiable class of feelings. Women are tolerated, helped on, pitied and even welcomed where men might meet a very different treatment; if, that is, they possess Madame Pfeiffer's precise list of qualifications, and are of mature age and without personal attractions; with no wealth to be robbed of, and no particular delicacy to be shocked; with a boundless toleration, and owning no object but amusement; and with ten times the health, strength, vigour, patience, endurance, coolness, and readiness of any ordinary man. Those who bear in mind some of Madame Pfeiffer's achievements will not consider this any overstatement, and we must say there is such an air of truth and accuracy, and so little tendency to exaggeration in her style, that we must believe her account of her own doings, though they rest on her sole authority.

In the pursuit of her journey she travelled from Bagdad to Mossul, a distance of 300 miles, without guide or companions, in a native caravan, with no other comforts or conveniences than the poorest Arab of the party, and without other food than bread and cucumbers; with no shelter from the intense heat by day in this, one of the hottest countries of the world, and travelling all night in danger of robbers; and this for fourteen days without once changing her dress; and at the end, after much needed ablutions, finding her health unimpaired and her appetite inexhaustible. On another occasion, on economical grounds, motives which from necessity continually influenced her, she took a passage alone in a Chinese junk from Victoria to Canton, a thing unheard of, and from which she was earnestly dissuaded. But as she expresses it, 'I looked at the priming of my pistols, and embarked very tranquilly.' In her first acquaintance with savages at Rio Janeiro she passes the night in an Indian hut, conversing in signs, and eating whatever they bring her to eat. She walks through the whole length of Tahiti alone, with a tattooed Tahitian guide, gets him to make a fire with barbarian skill, and with half-dried clothes sleeps without shelter on a bed of leaves in the primæval forest. But we might multiply examples without end. Dangers which the claims of religion, or love, or faith, or patriotism, have now and then stirred up others to risk, the pure love of seeing, simple curiosity, the desire to change her place, have been motive enough for her to venture upon. While a storm was raging in the Atlantic, she caused herself to be tied to the binnacle of the vessel, to allow the waves to break over her, 'in order to absorb as much of the spectacle as possible.' When journeying alone with a wild Arab guide through a pass which she had been warned to be full of dangers, the peculiar and beautiful tints in

Digitized by Google

the rocks occupied her attention so much that she had no *time* for fear. In Tahiti, having heard of the native skill in making temporary boats at a few minutes' warning, she did not hesitate to trust herself to one, constructed by her guide of a few plantain branches tied together, in order to cross a lake to which he led her, and to allow herself to be propelled by him across, he swimming and she seated in the almost sinking bark. She runs the imminent risk of being stoned for the sake of seeing a Chinese garden, and very nearly incurs the same fate in her curiosity to see the manufacturing of tea. For the sight of a European *woman* excited such symptoms of dangerous animosity in the 600 workpeople of the establishment, that her conductor had earnestly to entreat her to forego the full inspection she had intended, and be content with a slight survey; and in consequence of this, 'she could only manage to observe that the 'leaves of the plant are thrown for a few seconds into boiling 'water, and then placed' &c. &c. In India, she is greatly delighted to receive an invitation to a tiger hunt, and though she owns to some alarms when a tiger on whom a shot had taken effect rushed maddened towards her, she kept herself so calm that none of the gentlemen had any knowledge of what was going on in her mind. And this curiosity is as indiscriminate as it is insatiable. She is almost as anxious to taste a new dish as to see a high mountain or a fine ruin. It leads her to inspect the dead-houses on the banks of the Hoogly, and the horrors by the side of the Ganges. She regrets that she has never been so lucky as to meet with dried grasshoppers as a favourite native dish. No prejudice prevents her giving an impartial and often a favourable judgment on the flavour of snakes and reptiles. This freedom from prejudice enabled her to carry out her rule of diet without so much discomfort as she would otherwise have endured.

'My rule in travelling is to exclude every kind of superfluity. Wherever I am certain to find people living, I take no eatables with me, for I can content myself with whatever they live upon. If I do not relish their food, it is a sign that I have not any real hunger, and I then fast till it becomes so great that any kind of dish is acceptable.'—*A Woman's Journey Round the World*, p. 250.

A rule which she can adhere to even when she herself witnesses the preparation of the meal; and some of her details of Arab cookery are anything but inviting. And as nothing is too revolting, so nothing is too dry or technical to excite her interest; she considers herself indemnified for a provoking delay by which she was detained five days in Valparaiso, by the opportunity it afforded her of inspecting some fine collections of mussel shells and insects. But while this instinct never sleeps, it by no means obscures her judgment: her palate, for instance, never forgets

Digitized by Google

delightful European flavours, her organ of smell, though severely tried, never loses its disgust at evil odours, nor does reserve lead her to keep these things in the background. The drawbacks to the pleasures of attending a Tahitian funeral are dwelt upon; the revolting details of a Hindoo burning are hinted at; dirt and smell, and bad company, none pass without mention in straightforward and not very refined language. But whatever has to be endured she endures coolly and patiently; nothing very much puts her out but being cheated. After having walked through Canton with a Chinese guide, and thereby excited the wonder of her European friend, who thought she could not have escaped alive, (for the Chinese are an exception to the general friendly feeling towards women,) she says, 'I certainly had remarked 'on my way from the vessel to the factory, that both old and 'young turned back and looked after me, and that they hooted 'and pointed at me with their fingers; the people ran out of 'their booths and gradually formed a crowd at my heels. I had, 'however, no alternative but to keep my countenance; I walked, 'therefore, calmly on;' and we may add, was by no means too flurried to make her usual train of observations by the way.

Having to perform her long journeyings with an incredibly small sum for her expenses, Madame Pfeiffer is keenly alive to the virtue of generosity, and even more so to the contrary vices of grasping and covetousness wherever she meets with them, and as her only mode of judging of these qualities is so far as she is personally affected by them, some amusing touches are the result. She is never more indignant, we are sorry to say, than with the overcharging and really shameful cheating, as it seems, which she met with in an English steamer, from Canton to Singapore; our sympathies go with her, as she details the badness and the dearness of the fare, which was the harder, as they would not allow her to go third class, as she had wished, but forced her to incur the expense of a second cabin. We fear this incident will permanently prejudice her ideas of the English character, as on the other hand, she is often led into comparisons highly favourable of Mussulmans and Hindoos over Christians, because of the superior ideas of hospitality often to be found in semi-barbarous tribes. She is disgusted with her Tahitian guide for the insolence of his charge of a pound a day (which of course she did not pay), though her history of this pedestrian tour might well drive such things out of her thoughts, or even make any charge not unreasonable. For in the course of it she forded a river sixty-two times. She received several severe wounds in her hands and feet, and had frequently to be dragged by main force by her guide, besides other minor hardships. The vulgar proverb of 'cheap and nasty' does not hold with her, for

Digitized by Google

in fact, nothing can be really nasty that is cheap, and she finds a pleasure in detecting the failures which attended any more expensive modes of progress she might be forced to adopt.

In religion even this economic principle comes in. She had no objection on one occasion 'to afford a Bonze the gratification' of offering a lighted taper to his idol, and was only hindered from doing so by what she considered the injudicious zeal of the American Missionary, who attended her and told her it was idolatry; but she is really concerned at the quantity of oil unnecessarily consumed in China in keeping night lamps burning before their domestic altars, and it is not unlikely that the scale of expense on which the Missionaries wherever she went lived, according to her ideas of expense and luxury, may have inclined her to form the unfavourable view she has expressed of the extent and success of their labours. She would regard the profuse distribution of tracts and Bibles as a great outlay, and has quite a thrifty sympathy for liberal givers at home, whose money she thinks so recklessly laid out. We feel, indeed, that a person travelling in her manner and with her object, and not knowing the language of any country through which she passed, cannot and ought not to be regarded at all in matters which are beyond the reach of eyesight and superficial observation. Her proposal that Missionaries should always marry *native* wives wherever they are, as then neither wife nor child will be incommoded by the climate, proves her blunted perceptions on such subjects. But though incapable of discussing or understanding the religious bearings of any question, she is good authority on many moral points which show themselves more on the surface, especially on national manners towards dependents and inferiors, from which much may be inferred. She observes that the Chinese delight in tormenting animals, that the Hindoos are humane, that the English are bullying to the natives over whom they rule; the Arabs indulgent to their children, and in their turn obedient and dutiful to their parents; that the Tahitians in their transition, half savage state, have little feeling of any kind towards any person; that the Russians in their official capacity are, towards foreigners, the most rude and bearish of all Christian people. Here, however, prejudice probably steps in to give point to her impressions, but in every case, whether in trifles or matters of importance, she gives her own observations, what she has seen or been herself concerned in. The reader may believe her facts without being bound to her inferences or conclusions. She is proud of the independence of her judgment, of never being misled to undue praise by books or travellers' reports, of never indulging in second-hand enthusiasm, though she has the habit common with

Digitized by Google

persons who pique themselves on this quality, of as it were enhancing the candour of the actual opinion, by enlarging on the docility and differential state of mind previous to forming it, and professing to be wound up to a pitch of enthusiasm by representations hitherto implicitly received, but which fade at once before a judgment trained to bow before the majesty of truth. The following passage from the preface puts Madame Pfeiffer's powers in a just light, and here she really shows a just estimate of her claims to attention, allowing for a very natural expression of modesty.

'I have been called in many public journals a professed tourist, but I am sorry to say that I have no title to the appellation in its usual sense. On the one hand I possess too little wit or humour to render my writings amusing; and on the other, too little knowledge to judge rightly of what I have gone through. The only gift to which I can lay claim is that of narrating in a simple manner the different scenes in which I have played a part, and the different objects I have beheld; if I ever pronounce an opinion, I do so merely on my own personal experience.'—*Ibid. Pref.* p. ix.

It is time now to turn to the narrative of her voyage to Iceland, which, as we have said, preceded her larger undertaking in order of time, though it is latest known to the English reader, and which gave her such just confidence in her strength and other powers as led her to project it. Her first essay in travel had been what would once have been termed, a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. She speaks of having long dwelt in the inexpressible happiness of treading the soil which had been hallowed by the presence of her Saviour, but the perusal of her later works leads us to suspect that the natural impulse must have been at least as powerful as the religious one in instigating her to the unusual effort; and here we will say, that a perusal of two of her works leaves us still in doubt as to the 'denomination' of Christians to which she belongs. Though a Viennese, she shows herself too ready with all the weak points of the system, and of too sceptical a spirit towards some of its chief pretensions, to be a Roman Catholic, and yet the terms towards Protestants and Lutherans which drop from her pen are sometimes of so critical and external a character as to deter us from placing her at once in their ranks. However, the conclusion to be arrived at from what she does say is, that these are among the questions which she holds to be of very little moment. In her preface she thus describes the leading passion of her life in its dawning:—

'From my earliest childhood I have had an intense longing to go forth into the wide world. I could never meet a travelling carriage without stopping to watch it as it passed out of my sight, envying the very postilion who had accompanied it, as I thought during the whole long journey.

'When I was a little girl of ten or twelve years old, no reading was so

attractive to me as books of travels; and ceasing to envy the postilions, I could not but repine at the happiness of every great navigator or discoverer, who could explore the yet unrevealed secrets of the natural world.

'Tears often rose to my eyes if, after climbing a hill, I found others towering up beyond my reach, and I could not see what lay concealed behind them. I travelled a great deal with my parents, and also with my husband after I was married, and it was not till my two boys were of an age to be sent to school that I remained stationary on their account.'—*Voyage to Iceland, Pref.* p. vi.

She then speaks of her first journey alone to Palestine, and concludes, after one of those little disclaimers against vanity which she often expresses, and which inevitably suggest some truth in the implied charge, with her reasons for selecting Iceland as her second theatre of adventure:—

'Iceland was a country where I hoped to behold nature under an aspect entirely new or peculiar. I feel so supernaturally happy, and draw so close to my Maker while gazing upon such scenes, that no difficulties or fatigues can discourage me from seeking so great a reward.

'Should death surprise me in any of my wanderings, I shall meet it with calmness, thanking God from my inmost heart for the blessed happy hours I have spent in admiring the wonders of His creation.'—*Ibid. Pref.* p. viii.

There is something sufficiently strange to the unadventurous part of the community in the strong attraction that the north possesses over many minds, and which is well figured in the very emblem of attraction, the loadstone, finding its home there. But coldness and desolation are in themselves inspiring from the exercise they give to powers which sleep in ease and comfort, so that in addition to her hope of seeing in Iceland 'a country 'peculiarly unblessed by nature, to which nothing similar is to be 'found on earth, what would fill her with new and unutterable 'astonishment,' this good lady, who knew of what tough materials she was made, probably had an unconscious longing to pitch her strength against the elements, and to prove what she could do.

She set out then from Vienna in 1845, and after some little time spent in Copenhagen, sailed for Iceland in the May of that year, and after eleven days, during which she was the victim of sea sickness, like any other mortal, reached Havenfiord, the haven of her hopes, some eight miles from Reikjavick, the real capital of Iceland, though in our school days we used to give Skalholt this name. In the preparations for her voyage for Copenhagen, and during her subsequent residence, she owed much to the attention of M. Knudson, a Danish gentleman, in deservedly high favour with travellers, and apparently the good genius of Iceland: for not only does Madame Pfeiffer profess herself indebted to him as the source of whatever kindness she received in the island, but we find a similar honourable mention of him by Mr. Barrow, who made the same expedition in 1834.

Digitized by Google

But while the desolation, the grandeur, the beauty of Iceland more than equalled Madame Pfeiffer's hopes, its lava streams, its burning mountains, its boiling springs,—the great battle between hot and cold which is for ever going on there,—she unquestionably considers the world to have been misled by the romantic descriptions which it has received from time to time of its hospitable gentry, its learned body of clergy, its cultivated peasantry. The fancy picture of the island which Fouqué has drawn, waving with tall forests of elms and pines, amid which rise lofty stone castles, the homes of heroes, is hardly more removed from the present reality of wooden mansions and turf roofed hovels, and dwarfed and rare foliage, than are those pastoral descriptions of calm learned leisure, dignifying privation and even poverty, and universally diffused knowledge,—implying to our ears a refined civilization,—from the actual existing state of things which her book unfolds; a cold and narrow-minded higher class, a populace living in squalid dirt, a body of clergy compelled to eke out their scanty stipends by toiling like any common labourer in the parish, and shoeing all the horses beside. There is no doubt, however, that Madame Pfeiffer was somewhat prejudiced by her first start in Iceland society. It is clear that the only class of travellers that have hitherto visited Iceland have come accredited not only with letters through which they may expect to receive hospitality, but with the power in their turn of offering some equivalent. The French officers can give gay balls in their frigate, the Englishman in his yacht a lively breakfast; the naturalist comes with funds from his government, and dispenses money right and left for specimens. Poor Madame Pfeiffer came alone, necessitated to live in the cheapest and most frugal manner, and incapable of making any other return than what is after all the most valuable one that can be given, late news and fresh intelligence from foreign lands. The ladies of Iceland were either ignorant or insensible to these attractions. Madame Pfeiffer was not likely to come charged with the latest fashions, and we can imagine her appearance not imposing; they probably thought her an oddity, with whom it would be safest to have nothing to do, and in spite of good letters of introduction she was neglected. She therefore not unnaturally sets down the Icelanders as a selfish people, who will do nothing without the hope of return, and thus relates and accounts for her isolation on first taking up her quarters at Reikjavick. After describing the cold mode in which the lady of the Stiftsamtmann (for such is the title of the governor) received her, she adds:—

'The minor functionaries all trod dutifully in the steps of their superior, and I did not receive any visits or invitations, although I frequently

heard of the parties of pleasure, dinners, and evening entertainments, which were going on in the place. If I had not known how to occupy myself more profitably, time would have hung very heavily on my hands. It never seemed to occur to any of these ladies that I was a stranger, alone, and entirely debarred from all educated society. Of course, being no longer young, I felt I had no claims on the attention of the gentlemen: and the privation did not cost me much regret. If the women were wanting in consideration, I could not expect to find it in the men.

'I pondered on the cause of this behaviour, till I discovered its social spring in the selfishness which is a striking characteristic of the people. As soon as I arrived in Reikjavick, diligent inquiries were made from all quarters, if I were rich, if I should entertain much company, or if there were anything to be gained by waiting upon me. Persons of large fortune, or great naturalists, are the only travellers who have a chance of being received well in Iceland.'—*Ibid.* p. 74.

We give this passage, that our readers may be on their guard; for nothing so unfits a person for candid judgment as any sense of personal slight; and we think that in money matters Madame Pfeiffer is rather suspicious, and ready to cast national imputations on insufficient grounds. She makes much, for instance, of the lower class besieging her with specimens of lava, insects, or other poor rarities of their soil and climate, and asking unreasonable sums for them, as if this humble form of imposition were not common to human nature everywhere to be found, wherever collectors are willing to exchange current coin for objects of such mere conventional value that the ignorant may well be excused for thinking them all equally worthless, and the connoisseur as a person with more money than wit, and, therefore, a natural prey. We are not justifying this state of feeling: we only say it is universal, and what no country ought to be judged by.

Madame Pfeiffer criticises the gait and deportment of Icelandic ladies as characterised by a stiff second-hand coldness and hauteur which they have not real dignity to make natural. This demeanour is not unsuited to the aspect and architecture of their capital, which amongst pieces of formality and wooden stiffness must stand unrivalled. We judge not only from description, but from the sketches with which travellers furnish us. Except the church, there are but two stone buildings in the place. One was built for a prison, but crimes are so rare in Iceland, that the Stiftsamtmann has taken possession of it for his palace; the other is appropriately occupied by the bishop. The merchants' dwellings are all of wood, and consist of only one story. These stand side by side, with the separate uncomfortable distinctness of houses out of a toy-box, an effect which is probably inevitable where Nature has not vigour to take the works of man into her own keeping to adapt and adorn them, but has almost more than she can do in concealing the

Digitized by Google

ravages of her own wild freaks of desolating fury. Some houses have gardens attached to them; but few climates in the world are so unfavourable to horticulture; and a dish of potatoes, cabbages, or turnips, costs incredible pains in the rearing. Our countryman Mr. Barrow speaks tenderly of the pains a genuine garden-lover will take even under such adverse circumstances, and with so forbidding a climate. Success is always a relative thing; and it is possible even in Iceland to be proud of a garden.

'Radishes and turnip-radishes, mustard and cress, seemed to thrive the best in the governor's garden; but he bestowed much care and labour on his little piece of ground, and often took great pleasure in pointing out to me the healthy state and vigour of three or four plants of the mountain-ash, which (after I forget how many years' growth) had attained to the height of about four feet, and on the possession of which he prided himself not a little, assuring me that they were the largest, and, in fact, the only plants that deserved the name of trees within the distance of many miles round Reikjavick.'—*Barrow's Visit to Iceland*, p. 107.

Just such herbage and such gardens we may suppose the inhabitants of the moon to possess—if that the moon has inhabitants and gardens at all. There is something in the description of Iceland altogether that must remind those familiar with the maps of the moon which astronomers give us, of that rent and torn and convulsed little world, with its white peaks and dark hollows, and tracts between answering closely enough to the black lava-streams which give to Iceland its separate distinctive character, and make so strong an impression on the traveller.

In this country nature certainly should take precedence of man. We must, therefore, give our readers some of Madame Pfeiffer's descriptions of the scenes she had gone so far to witness, which are novel and striking enough. Before landing, she says:—

'My first impressions of the coast of Iceland were very different from the descriptions I had read in books. I had fancied a barren, desolate waste, without a bush or tree; and I saw grass-covered hillocks, copses, and even, as I thought, patches of dwarfish woods; but as we approached, and I could distinguish the different objects more plainly, the hillocks were changed into human habitations, with small doors and windows; and the groups of trees proved to be great lava-masses, from ten to fifteen feet high, entirely overgrown with grass and moss. Everything was new and surprising to me: I could hardly wait to land.'—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 57.

A few hours enabled her to make a closer survey:—

'Havenfiord is surrounded by a most beautiful and picturesque field of lava, which at first swells to a gentle eminence, then sinks again, and finally stretches, in one wide plain, to the neighbouring hills. The different masses, black and bare, arise, in the most varied shapes, to the height of ten or fifteen feet, and assume the figures of walls, pillars, grottoes, and

excavations, over which large level pieces will often make a natural bridge, the whole formed by blocks of congealed lava, which in some places are covered to their summit with grass and moss, presenting that delusive appearance of stunted trees which I saw from the ship. The horses, sheep, and cows, scramble about in these fields, industriously seeking out every green spot; and I myself was never weary of scrambling. I could not sufficiently admire and wonder at this fearfully beautiful picture of desolation. * * * The view is bounded on one side by several ranges of high mountains, among which the jokals (glaciers) were conspicuous, still covered far down their sides with the winter's snows; and on the other it is open to the sea. At a little distance, I was impressed with the belief that many of the valleys and hillocks were covered with verdure, and I thought I saw several beautiful meadows; but, upon a closer investigation, I ascertained that they were marshes, containing hundreds and hundreds of little eminences, not unlike molehills, or small grave-mounds, overgrown with grass and moss. From one spot I could overlook a wide circuit of eight or ten (German) miles (equivalent to thirty-six to forty-five English miles) without being able to perceive a single tree, or bush, or field, or village. All was lifeless. We passed a few scattered cottages, but we rarely heard the chirp of a bird, and still more rarely a friendly salutation from a human voice. We were completely surrounded with streams of lava, or bogs and swamps; not a spot was to be seen in that whole space which could have been turned up by the plough.'—*Ibid.* p. 67.

This scene equally strikes all travellers; nor does science seem able to account for the strange forms of these lava-fields, awful in their fantastic shapeless masses.

Madame Pfeiffer made Reikjavick her head-quarters, from whence she made various excursions after her own hardy independent fashion: indeed, the roads do not allow of much luxury of conveyance. There is not a carriage of any description, not even a wheelbarrow in the island, nor anywhere a road which could be traversed by them. Horses are universal: everybody rides; and these hardy, sure-footed creatures, which do their masters such good service, actually live out of doors all the winter; needing little more from man through this long and severe season than his assistance in removing the snow from the moss on which they chiefly subsist. They will not eat hay, but contrive just to keep themselves alive through the cold on this poor wintry fare, assisted by such offal from the fish as even an Iceland kitchen finds no use for, and when the grass grows once more, get up their strength and looks in a wonderfully short time, and are ready for work. One of her first excursions to the sulphur-springs, on which she set out on the 4th of June, brings her across a vast lava-stream:—

'About a mile beyond Havenfiord, I saw, for the first time, some birches, which were not more than two feet, or two feet and a half high, however. I also remarked some whortleberry-bushes; and a number of little butterflies, all the same size, and apparently of the same species, were fluttering around the plants and shrubs. The manifold shapes and figures into which the lava was thrown, constantly struck me with renewed astonishment;

and, short as this journey was—for I reached Krisuvick with ease in ten hours,—I found the scenery indescribably beautiful, and could never tire of gazing and admiring, as I slowly rode along, unmindful of the rain and cold, suffering my horse to pick his way at his own pace, and frequently losing my guide in consequence. One of the most remarkable currents of lava lay in a wide and long valley, where it appeared as if by enchantment, covering the whole centre with a broad stream half a mile in length. As there was no mountain in the neighbourhood from whence it could possibly have flowed, it must have concealed some immeasurable crater. The stream did not merely consist of isolated blocks and stones, but of high masses of porous rock, ten or twelve feet high, frequently riven in places a foot wide.

'In another valley, of still greater dimensions, being several miles in circumference, I saw a wavy stream, which could only be compared to a sea of stone; from its centre arose a high black hill, presenting a fine contrast to the light grey masses around it; and there I concluded, of course, that the lava had originated. But, upon examination, I found that it was smooth and clean on all sides, and its summit, in the shape of a sugar-loaf, completely closed, as was also the case with the other mountains about this valley; so that I looked in vain for any trace of a crater.'—*Ibid.* p. 115.

The road through these and similar scenes was so bad, that it was often necessary to dismount, and crawl on hands and knees through crevices, and on reaching the boiling springs (for Iceland is full of these phenomena), the soil constantly gave way, allowing her and her guide to sink above the ankles in steaming mud. Our space, however, will not allow us to linger amongst the minor wonders of the island: we must content ourselves with giving her impressions of the Great Geiser and Mount Hecla, probably the principal motives of her hazardous journey. At the first she spent three nights and two days of solitary watching,—for such we may call it, though occasionally visited by her guide. She had looked forward with excited awe to this occasion, and had told her friends, before leaving her home, that, if her courage failed her anywhere in Iceland, it would be in spending the night solitarily at the Geiser. A French *savant*, after his visit to this wonderful column of water, generously left behind him a tent for the convenience of future travellers; and here Madame Pfeiffer took up her abode, under more comfortable circumstances than her nights were sometimes passed.

The Geiser, it may be useful to explain to some of our readers, stands in a valley, or plain, of boiling fountains, of about twelve acres. So soon as the traveller turns the sharp angle of a range of hills that encloses it, he finds himself in the midst of smoke and steam. Nature's steam-engines are at work. Every step brings him amongst boiling springs and bogs of heated mud. The ground trembles under his feet; and from beneath are heard mutterings and rumblings like distant thunder. In the midst of smaller jets of steam and water, in various combination, rises the mound of the great Geiser, distin-

Digitized by Google

guished by its superior size and louder subterranean rumblings; at the top of which is the basin of the fountain, some four feet deep, and with a diameter of about fifty feet, and in its centre, forming a gigantic tunnel, a pipe or tube descends, up which the boiling water rises, and the eruptions burst forth. (See Barrow's Iceland, p. 177.) This tube, or caldron, together with the basin, in the intervals of the explosions are filled with boiling water, as clear as crystal. The explosions are capricious in their performances, and have to be waited for, giving the traveller leisure to make what scientific observations he is capable of in the period of anxious expectation. Madame Pfeiffer began her watch at night, not without some of the apprehensions natural to her sex, as well as peculiar to the situation:—

'The tent was put in order for me by eleven o'clock, when all took their leave, and I was left alone. For fear of missing an explosion, it is customary to watch during the whole night. An occasional vigil would present no great difficulty to many travellers; but for me it was a serious undertaking. However, there was no remedy; for an Iceland peasant is not to be depended upon, and few of them would be roused by an outbreak of Hecla itself.

'I sat beneath my tent, or in front of it, listening with stretched attention for the signs I had been told to expect. Towards midnight—the hour of spirits—I heard a few dull sounds, like those of a distant cannon, and rushing from my tent, I waited for the subterranean rumblings and the tremblings and splitting of the earth, which, according to the books I had read, were the forerunners of an eruption. I could hardly defend myself from a paroxysm of fear: it is no slight thing to be alone at midnight in such a scene. * * The low rumblings were repeated thirteen times at very short intervals, the basin overflowed after each noise, and nearly emptied itself of its waters, the sound appearing to proceed from their violent ebullition rather than from any subterranean commotion. In a minute and a half the shock was over. The waters no longer overflowed the basin and caldron, which remained nearly full; and, disappointed in every respect, I returned to my tent.'—*Ibid.* p. 173.

Nothing further occurred during the next day and following night, during which she occupied her leisure in investigating the various wonders of the scene—the Strokker, a boiling fountain, leaping and bubbling with extraordinary violence, sharing the fame of the Geiser, but not reaching to the same height, and two springs close together, to her mind among the most beautiful in the world, from their wonderful clearness, and a sort of supernatural play of colours in them, independent of the sunshine.

'At last, after waiting till the second day of my sojourn at the Geiser, the long-desired explosion took place, on the 27th of June, at half-past nine in the evening. * * I have really no words to do justice to this magnificent spectacle, which once to behold in a lifetime is enough. It infinitely surpassed all my expectations. The waters were spouted with great power and volume; column rising above column, as if each were bent on outstripping the others. After I had recovered in some degree from my first

Digitized by Google

astonishment, I looked round at the tent—how small, how diminutive it seemed compared to those pillars of water! and yet it was nearly twenty feet high. It was lying rather lower, it is true, than the basin of the Geiser; but tent might have been piled on tent,—yes, by my reckoning, which may not have been perfectly accurate, however,—five or six, one above the other, would not have reached the elevation of these jets, the largest of which I think I can affirm, without any exaggeration, to have risen at least to the height of a hundred feet, and to have been three or four feet in diameter.'—*Ibid.* p. 177.

We have no space for the observations which follow, though all details of such a phenomenon are interesting. The following is her conclusion, in which she combats all the excited histories of this wonder, and takes occasion to warn her readers against travellers' tales generally:—

'During the three nights and two days which I spent in the immediate vicinity of these wonderful springs, I watched with the closest attention for every minute particular of their outbreaks, of which I saw five in all; and I must declare, that the descriptions of the Geiser which I had read in various books are by no means correct; as I never, for instance, heard any greater uproar than what I have already mentioned in the course of my narrative, and never felt the least symptom of an earthquake, although during one of the explosions I even put my ear to the ground.

'It is really singular how blindly some people will repeat what they hear, and how others again will permit their excited fancies to see and hear what does not actually occur; while not a few travellers will not scruple to add even a downright falsehood to the tale. I met at the house of Mr. Moller the apothecary, of Reikjavick, an officer of the French frigate, who asserted, as an instance of what I mean, that "he had ridden directly into the crater of Mount Vesuvius." Doubtless he was far from suspecting there was any one in the company likely to contradict him. But nothing provokes me so much as a deliberate invention of this nature, and I could not help asking him how he could possibly have accomplished such a feat; for I had also been to Vesuvius, and was probably as reckless of danger as he was, but I had been compelled to leave my donkey when I reached the top of the mountain, and advance into the crater on foot. At this he was a little embarrassed, and explained himself, saying, "he only meant us to understand he had ridden *nearly* into the crater;" and yet I would wager that he had told the same story many a time, and ended by believing it himself.'—*Ibid.* p. 181.

Madame Pfeiffer has not, we really think, any tendency to this error; even in her most excited moments common sense is on the watch; as in her extempore expedient for measuring the fountain by the tent, by which she arrives at precisely the proper conclusion, as we learn from the list of guesses given by different travellers, and varying from the impossible supposition of 360 feet to the understatement of 90. Except in their estimate of the character and moral condition of the inhabitants, the accounts of Madame Pfeiffer and our countryman tally curiously well. In one point she may boast a superiority, which her sex constitutes a real triumph. Mr. Barrow, in spite of a natural longing to ascend Hecla, yielded to the general dissuasion, and

Digitized by Google

relinquished his design; Madame Pfeiffer accomplished hers, and, all things considered, makes very little fuss about the fatigue and danger of doing so. We are far from saying that Mr. Barrow's was not the wiser decision; but this must not deprive the enterprising German lady of her due credit.

'After all,' (says Mr. Barrow,) 'there is no great wisdom, perhaps, in courting both toil and danger, by climbing up a mountain buried in snow, where nothing is to be seen. The people in the neighbourhood, it seems, discourage every one from attempting it. When the French doctor made the attempt, he was told that it was the entrance into the infernal regions, and that the devil was busily employed in handing down the souls of all those who fall in battle. Sir Joseph Banks was told that the mountain was guarded by a number of strange black birds, resembling crows; and with beaks of iron, they would receive in a very ungracious manner any one who might presume to infringe upon their territory. Sir Joseph found the mountain surrounded, as the Frenchman says, for two leagues, with scoriæ, pumice-stone, cinders, and ashes. On reaching the summit, which was calculated from the state of the barometer to be five thousand feet, the cold was extremely severe, and the party had their clothes covered with ice in such a manner, that, to use his own expression, "clothes resembled buckram." As there was nothing to see, there was no object to induce them to prolong their stay. Sir George Mackenzie climbed up amidst fog and ashes; got to the top, where he found a small crater filled with snow; looked round when the sky cleared up a little, and then came down again. All things considered, therefore, I may perhaps console myself for my disappointment with the reflection, that I have lost but little pleasure, and escaped much fatigue; but still it would have been something to say, "I have been to the summit of Hecla."'—*Barrow*, p. 197.

Madame Pfeiffer's difficulties came in a more characteristic form. She was assailed, not through her imagination, but her purse—the claims of which she always regards; knowing it in fact to be the only substitute in these times for the seven-leagued boots and other conveniences with which our childhood was familiar. The guide who was to lead her through, and himself to share all these disagreeables and dangers, asked her the 'outrageous sum of five dollars, and two marks,' which, put into English, is just eleven shillings and sixpence, for this formidable day's work for himself and his horse. 'What could I do?' asks this most thrifty of wonder seekers; 'there was no other guide 'to be had, and he knew it well, so I was obliged to accede to 'his terms.' So having passed the night in what she calls a loathsome hole, sleeping on a chest shorter than herself, and close to a half-putrid fish drying in the smoke—for such are the comforts of an Iceland hut, enhanced in this case by finding herself an object of curiosity to all the inhabitants of the hamlet, who crowded in through the open door to superintend her repose—she was ready betimes to begin her journey:—

'It was a beautiful warm morning, and we galloped gaily over the meadows and the adjacent sand plains. This fine weather was considered a very favourable omen by my guide, who told me that M. Geimard, the French naturalist already mentioned, had been delayed three days by a

storm before he could ascend the mountain: this was nine years ago, and no one had made the attempt since that time. A Danish prince (who was in the island with Mr. Barrow), who travelled through Iceland a few years since, had been here indeed, but for some unexplained reason he had left the place without undertaking to visit Hecla. The road led at first, as I have already said, through rich fields, and then across the patches of black sand, which are surrounded on all sides by streams, hills, and hillocks of lava, whose fearful masses gradually approach each other, and frequently afford no other passage than a narrow passage, where we scrambled over the blocks and piles with scarcely a spot to rest our feet. The lava rolled around and behind us, and it was necessary to be constantly on the watch to prevent ourselves from stumbling, or to avoid coming in contact with the rolling rocks. But the danger was even greater in the gorges filled with snow, already softened by the heat of the season; where we frequently broke through, or what was worse, slid backwards at every step almost as far as we had advanced. I do not believe there is another mountain in the world whose ascent offers as many difficulties as this one.

'After a toilsome struggle of three hours and a half, we reached the place where it was necessary to leave the horses behind; which I should have done long before, as I felt compassion for the poor animals, if my Hecla guide would have allowed it; but he maintained that there were still spots where we might need them, and advised me moreover to ride as long as possible, in order to reserve my strength for what was still before me. And he was right; I hardly think I could have completed the whole distance on foot, for when I thought I had attained the last peak, I still found streams and hillocks between me and my goal, which seemed constantly more remote than ever. My guide assured me that he had never led any one so far on horseback, and I really believe it. The walking was already horrible, but to ride was fearful.

From every height new scenes of the most melancholy desolation appeared in sight; the whole prospect was rigid and inanimate, and burnt black lava was spread around us wherever we looked. It was not without a painful sensation that I gazed about me, and saw nothing but the immeasurable chaos of this stony desert.

'We had still three heights to climb; they were the last, but also the most perilous. The road led abruptly over the rocks by which the whole summit of the mountain was covered; I had more falls than I could count, and frequently tore my hands on the sharp points of lava. It was, to be sure, a terrible expedition.

'The dazzling whiteness of the snow was almost blinding, contrasted with the shining black lava alongside of it. When I had to cross a field of snow, I did not venture to look at the lava, for I had tried it once, and could hardly see in consequence. I was snow-blind. At last the summit was attained, after two more hours of laborious climbing, and I stood upon the highest peak of Hecla; but I looked in vain for a crater—there was no trace of any to be found; at which I was all the more astonished, as I had read minute accounts of it in several books of travels.'—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 197.

She pursues her search for a crater in vain, and finds rents and chinks instead, from whence she supposes the streams of lava to have flowed. For a while the prospect is obscured by clouds, and by a snow-storm whitening the dark lava around her.

'Gradually the clear and inimitable blue of the heavens reappeared, and the sun once more rejoiced us with his presence. I remained on the top of the mountain till the clouds had opened in the distance, and afforded a welcome and extensive view, which I fear my pen is much too feeble to

describe. I despair of conveying to my reader a distinct idea of the immense waste which lay displayed before me, with its accumulated masses of lava and its peculiar appearance of lifeless desolation. I seemed to stand in the midst of an exhausted fire. The blocks were piled in heaps above each other, till they formed high hills; the valleys were choked by vast streams of rock, whose height and breadth I was not able to distinguish, although the course of the last eruption could plainly be distinguished among them.

'I was surrounded by the most dreadful ravines, caves, streams, hills and valleys; I could hardly understand how I had reached this point, and was seized with a feeling of horror at the thought which forced itself upon me, that perhaps I might never be able to find my way out of this terrible labyrinth of ruin.

'There, on the highest peak of Hecla, I could look down far and wide upon the uninhabited land, the image of a torpid nature, passionless, inanimate —and yet sublime; an image which once seen can never be forgotten, and the remembrance of which will prove an ample compensation for all the toils and difficulties I had endured. A whole world of glaciers, mountains of lava, fields of snow and ice, rivers and miniature lakes, were included in that magnificent prospect; and the foot of man had never ventured within those regions of gloom and solitude. * * * I thank my God that He has allowed me to see this chaos of His creation.'—*Ibid.* p. 200.

Our authoress in this case has succeeded in conveying a picture—an awful scene is well described. Hecla, when she saw it, had had no eruption for eighty years, and was regarded as an exhausted volcano; five months after, it broke out with greater fury than ever.

What space remains to us we must now bestow on the observations Madame Pfeiffer was able to make, on the habits and manners of the people, during her stay in the island, which extended from the middle of May to the end of July. We have said that she considers the reports on these points, hitherto given by travellers, to be romantic and too favourably coloured. Some of their chief faults, which might pass unnoticed or only guessed at by wealthier travellers, who carry their own conveniences with them, and provide themselves with tents for their accommodation at night, she was in a condition to see and judge of, living more amongst them than others would venture to do. She can thus pronounce very decidedly on the extreme, enormous dirt of the lower orders in Iceland, and again on their indolent, unpunctual, and as she thinks, selfish habits. Whatever stood in the way of her own plans would be likely to be severely viewed; but on both points Mr. Barrow also speaks. While he can only hope and charitably suppose that the interior of an Iceland hut may be better and a less intolerable lodging than the outside promises, Madame Pfeiffer from personal experience can pronounce the worst anticipations to be far more than realized.

'Icelandic huts are small and low, built of lava blocks filled in with earth, the whole sodded over with grass, and they might easily be mistaken

Digitized by Google

for natural elevations on the ground, if the wooden chimneys, the low doors, and almost imperceptible windows, did not betray that they were tenanted by human beings; a dark and narrow passage, not more than four feet high, leads on one hand to the dwelling-room, and on the other to the store-room, where the provisions are kept, and which is used in winter to stable the cows and sheep. The fireplace is generally at the end of this passage, which is purposely built low, in order to exclude the cold. The walls and floors of these huts are not boarded; the dwelling-rooms are barely large enough to sleep in, and perhaps to turn round; the whole furniture consists of the bedsteads, and with a very scanty supply of bedding, a small table, a few chests; the latter are used for seats as well as the beds. Poles are fastened in the walls, to which clothes, shoes and stockings, and other things of that kind are suspended; and a little shelf, with a few books on it, is generally found in each hut. No stoves are needed in these crowded rooms, which are sufficiently heated by the warmth of their numerous inmates.

'There are also poles in the fireplaces to hang up the wet clothing and dry the fish. The smoke often spreads itself over the room, and finds its way very slowly out of the air-holes. There is no wood for fuel in the whole island. The rich import it from Norway and Denmark, and the poor burn turf, to which they then add fish-bones or fat, and a most offensive smoke proceeds from the disgusting offal.

'On entering one of these hovels it is impossible to say which is the worst, the suffocating smoke of the passage, or the stifling air of the inner room. * * * I am persuaded that the horrible eruptions which are so common among the Icelanders, are more to be attributed to their unparalleled filthiness, than to the climate or their peculiar food.'—*Ibid.* p. 65.

These observations were made on first landing, but her subsequent experience only confirms the first impression.

'In my distant travels throughout the country, I found the huts of the peasantry everywhere equally dirty and miserable. Of course I do not mean to say there were no exceptions, for even here a few rich peasants can well afford to live in greater comfort, according to their means and inclinations. But to my notion we should judge of the habits of a people by the mass, and not by the few, as many travellers are in the habit of doing, and very rare indeed were the examples of cleanliness which I saw.'—*Ibid.* p. 66.

We will spare our readers more detailed allusions to this national characteristic, in which our authoress's pages abound. The parsonages of the Clergy seem built, with few exceptions, on the same model as the huts of their parishioners, and subject to the same evils, though generally in a modified degree. Still no traveller who can get the church for his night's lodgings will undertake the discomforts of a night spent at the priest's house. The Churches are the *Inns* of Iceland, and may be reckoned on for this purpose. Madame Pfeiffer is shocked at the desecration, but necessity makes her rejoice that it outlasts her time. We must give a sketch of one of these buildings, the first she slept in, and more comfortable than others where she also passed the night, except that she was not yet inured to the publicity of the thing.

'The churches in this country are not merely reserved for religious purposes; they are also used to store away the provisions, tools, and

clothing; and are generally appropriated as night quarters for the traveller. I doubt if so great a desecration of a sacred building would be permitted even among the most uncivilized nations. It is true that I was assured the practice was about to be forbidden; but it ought never to have been allowed, and I am by no means certain it will be discontinued in future, for wherever I went, the church was always at my service at night, and I was sure to find it half full of fish, tallow, and every other ill-savoured thing.

'The church at Krisuvick is twenty feet long and ten feet wide, and it was very far from being in a condition to accommodate me on my arrival; but saddles, stockings, dresses, hats, and implements of every description were hastily thrown into a corner; blankets were produced, with two or three beautiful soft pillows, and my bed was made on the chest which contained the priestly garments and altar cloths. When this was done, I would gladly have shut myself in to prepare my evening meal, and write a few lines in my journal before I lay down to rest; but such a thing was not to be thought of; all the inhabitants came in a body to look at me, and I was soon surrounded by young and old, who streamed into the church, and hemmed me in on all sides. Unpleasant as was their staring, I was obliged to submit to it, for it would have been impossible to drive away the crowd without giving great offence; I therefore unpacked my little valise, and prepared to boil my coffee in public. Upon this, my spectators all put their heads together, and seemed lost in astonishment when I lighted the spirits of wine, following every movement with their eyes. My frugal supper ended, I found their perseverance had not flagged in the least; being determined to put it to the proof, I took out my journal and began to write. For a few moments they watched me in silence, when they all suddenly exclaimed: "She is writing, she is writing!" but they still made no sign towards leaving me, and remained perfectly motionless, every eye fixed upon me for a full hour; yes, I believe I might have been sitting there still without having been able to write them out of my presence, if it had not been too much to endure; at last I managed to dismiss my audience by giving them to understand that I wished to go to sleep.'—*Ibid.* p. 123.

Madame Pfeiffer gives us to understand that it is by no means pleasant spending the night alone in a church surrounded by a burying ground, and has more nervous feelings on the occasion than we should have given her credit for; however, it was only for the first time, and then probably because the cold and a storm of wind kept her awake. On another occasion, a clergyman whom she describes as a very well-informed, well-read man, entertained her, together with his wife and children, with a comfortable meal in the church, which was previously adorned with the clothing of himself and his family suspended from the altar-rails. Mr. Barrow gives a curious description of the Church of Thingvalla, where he and his party slept on their journey. To judge by his accompanying sketch, it must rank amongst the humblest Christian temples in the world, though he describes others in still more discreditable disorder. In approaching the village they had not been able to discover a human habitation, till some grass-covered elevations proved to be the dwellings of the inhabitants, one of which, larger than

Digitized by Google

the rest, was the church; there they asked leave to pass the night. It was full of stores, barrels of fish and the like; so that with their own travelling equipage, the aisle was nearly impassable. Its proportions were much the same as those of the church at Krisuvick; the altar consisted of a 'wooden chest or cupboard,' over which was a 'miserable' painting of the Lord's Supper; two small panes of glass let in light at the east end, and on the beams of the roof rested old Bibles, Psalters and MS. in dust and confusion. The party found their rest on the floor between the altar and the wall. The clergyman who allowed this was 'unremitting in his attentions,' and very civil and friendly, and so far a scholar, that he could converse in Latin with Mr. Barrow.

The religion of the island we need not say is Lutheran, with some departures, Madame Pfeiffer says, from the order of the service of that communion in her own country. The churches seem well attended considering the scattered nature of the parishes. Nor do we hear of any differences or divisions amongst them; the 300 clergy and their bishop are agreed, and their flocks, as far as we can gather, submit to their rule. But this unanimity loses much of its force and value when we contemplate the mode of life of the clergy, the necessary secularity of their pursuits, and the relation in which they stand to the people, 'labouring among them,' not so much in the ecclesiastical sense, as literally with their own hands for their maintenance. There is something, it cannot be denied, sordid in the existence described; their poverty has nothing poetical in it, nor perhaps can it have in a country so little blessed by nature. Clerical benefices in Iceland do not average above 10*l.* a-year, some of them are stated to be only 4*l.* The clergyman, to exist at all, has to spend his time as the peasants do, to toil in his scanty glebe in a labourer's dress, to add to his gains by the most incongruous employment—for the clergy are the acknowledged blacksmiths of the island, and each parsonage is furnished with a smithy;—to live in houses which hardly admit of comfort or cleanliness, and on fare which seems to unite every term of disparagement; meagre, unnutritious, sour, coarse, rancid. Such evils, acquiesced in rather than struggled against, speak for themselves, against the accounts of high mental cultivation with which readers were once amused. Jeremy Taylor says truly, that the student cannot live on the 'sossets and gobbets' of the peasant. Refinement in habits of living is necessary for the development of the intellect. Some reading no doubt there is in Iceland, and some learning, but its amount is only surprising from its existing in scenes where in our own country we should look only for brute ignorance—it would not be counted as *learning* in more civilized communities. And the

Digitized by Google

instances which are brought forward of high mental cultivation in juxtaposition with this sordid existence, only prove what we say. Much is made, for instance, of the fact, that the island possesses a printing press, and one '*triumph*' which is quoted, (and we do not dispute the term,) of intellect over pinching poverty, is the case of Jonas Thorlakson, a parish priest, who translated 'Pope's Essay on Man,' and the 'Paradise Lost,' into Icelandic verse, for which our own Literary Fund, hearing of his poverty, and anxious to show its sense of his labours, raised a small subscription sufficient to secure the affluence of his last days.

The peasants of Iceland too have a character for learning, and with some reason, for all can read, and it is said that a clergyman can refuse the rite of marriage to those who cannot. In their long winters, reading is said to be one of their amusements, and some of the peasants are so far scholars as to understand a little Latin, and books may often be seen in their wretched huts. But these acquirements promote neither ingenuity nor enterprise, nor any desire for comfort or cleanliness. They are remarked on as peculiarly without invention, and content with, or rather as doggedly attached to, the most awkward and inconvenient customs and contrivances. Both our travellers complain, for instance, of their mode of loading their horses. They seem to have no means really of keeping things on the animal's back. The whole burden is perpetually slipping off, and precious time is being lost all day long in lifting it on again, till the next loss of balance brings all down again. Our methodical alert adventuress is sensibly alive to these provocations. She points out swamps that they ought to drain, fields they ought to cultivate, and improvements of all sorts—such, for instance, as the use of chairs and tables, which are yet unknown luxuries in a peasant's hut,—which a little industry could effect; and 'having considered the Icelanders as the 'laziest people in existence, from the first moment of her arrival 'in the country,' she gives a little anecdote connected with one of the principal roads in the island to confirm her view.

'The moor where we stopped to rest was separated from the lava fields by a ditch, over which a bridge was formed by a few stones heaped together, but so carelessly that the horses could hardly advance without stepping into some of the holes, and they resisted so long before they could be made to venture across, that we were obliged to alight and lead them over.

'We had just passed this place, and established ourselves in the meadow, when a caravan of fifteen horses loaded with boards and dried fish came along. These animals remarked the danger of the bridge, and could only be driven over it by repeated blows of the whip. There was abundance of stone not twenty paces from the spot, but sooner than turn out of their way even for that short distance, these indolent creatures would rather cudgel

Digitized by Google

their horses, and let them run the risk of breaking their legs. I felt so much compassion for the poor animals who would have to cross the bridge in future, that as soon as the other party was out of sight, I devoted part of my hours of repose to collecting some large stones, with which I filled up the holes, a labour which was easily accomplished in fifteen minutes.'—*Ibid.* p. 138.

However, the mention of these horses reminds us of one ingenious expedient, which must we think be native to Iceland, and which ought in justice to be recorded. Mr. Barrow tells us:

'The Icelanders have a most curious custom and a most effectual one of preventing horses from straying, which I believe is peculiar to this island. Two gentlemen, for instance, are riding together without attendants, and wishing to alight for the purpose of visiting some object at a distance from the road, they tie the head of one horse to the tail of another, and the head of this to the tail of the former. In this state it is utterly impossible they can move on either backwards or forwards, one pulling one way and the other the other; and therefore, if disposed to move at all, it will only be in a circle, and even then there must be an agreement to turn their heads the same way.'—*Barrow's Iceland*, p. 252.

Is it a fabulous amplification of this practice, which we have been told of elsewhere, or a legitimate development of it,—that the congregation of an Iceland church secure their horses by tying them head to tail in a large ring round the building, about which they trot in an endless circlet till the returning worshippers release them?

But though Madame Pfeiffer declaims against their indolence and unpunctuality, anathematizes their dirt, depreciates their learning, suffers from their rude curiosity, and shows up their love of money—'no money, no Icelander,'—she yet does allow them some genuine sterling good qualities. They are all well and comfortably clad, there are no beggars among them, and she pronounces them absolutely trustworthy; she could leave her things lying about for hours, and never missed the least thing. It would, she says, be perfectly safe to sleep there without bolts and bars, and crimes are of such rare occurrence, that as we have said, the prison has been put to other uses. This immunity, we are sorry to see from Mr. Barrow's statistics, does not however extend to sins against what is most commonly understood by *morality*, and while he commends their sobriety, Madame Pfeiffer speaks of drunkenness as the national vice; but this difference may be accounted for by brandy having been of late years very much cheaper, as well as by her own want of experience in the habits of northern nations, where ardent spirits are always drunk in a much larger proportion than in the south.

It is not fair to our authoress to conclude without some mention of the extraordinary hardships through which she worked her way to an acquaintance with this wild and cheerless,

Digitized by Google

though beautiful country; so cheerless indeed to all but its own children, that we owe some apology to these, for having dwelt upon their alleged national failings at all, when we consider how few of what we regard as the pleasures and blessings of life they possess, and how contented is their existence in scenes and a climate full, to more fortunate men, of intolerabe privations. Madame Pfeiffer did not indeed prove what an Iceland *winter* is, but its best season is a bad one to live in, especially exposed as she was to all its vicissitudes by day and night, if we can apply, as she says, that term to their short summer twilight. After describing a halt, necessary from the exhausted state of the horses, in an open field in a pouring rain, where she had no alternative but to walk, weary as she was, or sit down on the wet ground, she says:—

'I think I may flatter myself that I was born to be a traveller; I never take cold from any degree of exposure; in this whole tour I had not a single warm meal, nor any substantial food. I slept every night on chests or benches, rode fifty-five miles (about 247 English miles) in six days, besides scrambling about in the Grotto of Surthellix; and in spite of all these privations and hardships I returned to Reikjavick in perfect health and spirits.'—*Voyage to Iceland*, p. 165.

In giving advice to travellers in general, she speaks of what economy obliged her to endure, especially the necessity of riding 'incredible' distances to obtain any shelter for the night. Also her distaste for Iceland cookery, and the disregard of cleanliness with which it was managed,—for she is not in this volume quite as independent of such considerations as experience afterwards made her,—confined her sometimes for ten days at a time to bread and cheese. The dangers of the way were often really alarming; where, for example, the path led over fields of snow far from any human habitation, ready to crack under the horses' feet and to precipitate the rider into inextricable depths; or where swollen rivers had to be forded, and the horses, in terror at the torrent around them, could scarcely be brought to obey the rein. Our readers, however, are acquainted with Madame Pfeiffer's spirit; we have only to show them that Iceland afforded a good education for her, more varied adventures. And every danger passed, with her, was in truth and in more senses than one, a danger over, as she explains in re-fording the torrent which had the first time really alarmed her.

'When I rode up the Rangaa, I crossed it a second time without the least alarm, although I had no longer a protector [a kind village priest who had guided her before] by my side. Such is our nature; dangers once passed have no longer the power to terrify us; we meet them with scarcely a thought, and are only surprised to remember how much uneasiness we may have suffered at first.'—*Ibid.* p. 204.

Digitized by Google

This is doubtless a true saying as well as a good rule, but it needs a brave spirit to adventure upon known dangers a second and a third time, till custom has power to exercise its sure control over the mind. In saying our farewell to this singular woman, we must wish her good success in her present undertaking, one in which she is engaged while we write, and which we should describe as more formidable as well as more useful than any previous journey, but that it is feared that want of means will prevent her carrying out her full design, which is no other than to penetrate into the interior of Africa, and bring to light some of the secrets of that hidden and mysterious land; trusting that a constitution that had borne the cold of Iceland and the heat of Babylonia unimpaired, might even endure the more subtle dangers which there await the European. But no sooner does she touch Cape-town than she is tormented by her monster evil, high charges. Not even in London or Canton does money fly so fast, and she stands in great danger, with her goal in view, and encouraged by all who know the habits of the natives to trust in her sex and adventure among them, to be turned back for the want of a very few hundred pounds. One person in the world has the inclination and all requisites for an important and hazardous work, but the money; amongst the hundreds of thousands who fail in all she possesses, and possess the one thing that she lacks, surely some one will be found to come forward and help her.

Digitized by Google

ART. II.—1. *The Poetical Works of David Macbeth Moir* (Δ). *Edited by* THOMAS AIRD; *with a Memoir of the Author.* Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London.

2. *The Poetical Works of John Edmund Reade.* London: Chapman & Hall.

IT is but a trite remark, that, as no two individuals are precisely the same externally in features and countenance, so likewise are there none altogether presenting the same cast and character of mind and thought. It is true also, that, as in respect of outward appearance it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between those who strongly resemble each other, so oftentimes it requires a subtle discrimination to discern the peculiarities of intellect in men whose minds seem to have been cast in the same mould. The majority of men, indeed, have so little which stands forth as preeminently characteristic; being formed as though after a general type, admitting manifold slight differences, which yet are in great measure merged in a general likeness. But even amongst men who are not to be classed with those who exhibit only this ordinary type of intellectual character, and in whom exist peculiarities both moral and mental, constituting a clear individuality, we do from time to time meet with examples of intellectual development which appear to belong to one or more in common,—wherein the dwelling on the cast of mind which one displays, instantly brings before us the picture of another. So much do the minds of some men appear but an echo of each other. But if the strong mental resemblances, which we frequently find in different individuals, are such as to make the task of discriminating between them no very easy matter, the utterly opposing and conflicting methods by which different minds may work out the same subject,—nay, even arrive, perhaps, at the same conclusion,—are even more remarkable and astonishing.

To analyse and classify the various forms of mental character which are found in men whose intellectual faculties have not been dulled by a protracted slumber, but have acquired vigour from constant exercise, is a work beyond our province;—but amidst all these indefinite varieties two especial types seem prominently to stand forth, which, although by no means serving for an exhaustive division, appear practically to distinguish men, who have not suffered their minds to remain inert, in ordinary life and conversation. These two classes seem to have

but little in common with each other; they will contemplate the same object, and their thoughts, after proceeding a step or two, as we might imagine, in the same direction, verge off almost invariably into entirely opposite tracks; or if by chance they hold a principle in common, or entertain the same opinion on a given question, the result will in very many cases have been obtained by modes of argument so contrary to each other, as to leave it a matter of wonder that methods thus conflicting could bring about an agreement in the end. And, as a consequence which might reasonably be inferred, men of these opposite forms of intellectual character will give utterance to their thoughts in a language which invariably attests its peculiar origin; expressions apparently conflicting in their signification will stand for the same objects,—and statements, more or less at variance with each other, may be found to represent sentiments which in reality are not very dissimilar. The distinguishing characteristic of these two classes (by whatever names we may choose to designate them) would appear to be this, that the one will deal with one object or question after another according to the peculiarities which each presents, comparing it with other things to which it may exhibit resemblance or contrast, —but probably resting content with this, unless it be requisite to advance further for the purposes of more general classification; with the other, any external object, after being apprehended by the mind, seems to undergo a kind of transformation; and the attempt to picture it results in a description which would appear to the other as having failed to describe those distinguishing properties which make the thing to be what it is. This seems to result from a constant tendency to look upon different objects as possessing certain qualities in common, and to dwell upon those qualities only,—a tendency which in the treatment of most questions brings them into regions which men of the other class would perhaps never enter, unless the subject involved the necessity of so doing, and causes them to speak as it were in terms of abstract science so constantly recurring as to create a strain in minds differently constituted. But, indeed, to men of this class everything seems to be but a link in one universal abstract science, to the further pursuit of which every sight and every sound appears calculated to lead them:—to such, the contemplation of a building will almost instantly suggest recondite questions of variety in unity, of proportion, harmony, and order; the sight of a picture lead them at once to its formal cause, or to thoughts on the general laws of colour; a landscape at once bring to mind the qualities of beauty or of power, of sublimity and grandeur which it possesses in common with others.

Digitized by Google

Such a mode of looking at things may perhaps be amenable to the charge of a monotonous and wearisome sameness, which is for ever treading in the same track, and ever loth to diverge either to the right hand or the left. The reply perhaps of most weight to this objection might be, that minds of this metaphysical character and generalizing tendency are adapted for the accomplishment of a work which can never be effected by those of the opposite stamp. Yet this also becomes matter of doubt upon consideration that, although men whose cast of mind seems ever to lead them into abstract thought rarely if ever speak the language which is used by men of different intellectual character, yet the latter are frequently well able and ready to handle questions of an abstract nature, or prepare themselves to master an abstract science; whence it would follow that their range of mind is, after all, a wider one. Whether such as these are calculated to reach the greatest heights of abstract research, and add to the amount of knowledge already gained, is another question; but it may well be doubted whether they, whose names in this province are most eminent, did, on whatsoever subject, ordinary or otherwise, exhibit the same tendency to generalize, and ever employed the same strained and monotonous language; and it might perhaps be a subject worthy of examination, whether the presence of the highest capabilities for abstract science may be consistent with the greatest power of looking upon and treating objects as existing in, so to speak, their concrete and embodied state. Howsoever this may be, there are certainly very many, who, without winning for themselves the highest celebrity in that province of knowledge the peculiar language of which they ordinarily employ, appear still for the most part incapable of clothing their thoughts in the expressions made use of by men whose minds are content to dwell in less remote and exalted regions, and exhibit in themselves the very opposite to the tendency for personification manifested by the Greek, a proneness to merge distinct individual form in the contemplation of general and pervading qualities.

Nor is the whole topic one which may be cursorily noticed and lightly laid aside, for it involves considerations of some moment in the giving judgment, in the way of either praise or blame, for the particular treatment of any given subject. The last-named class of minds is by no means scanty in numbers; it seems to exist in stronger force in other countries; but many belonging to it are to be found here also; and it becomes necessary to realize, so far as in us lies, the condition of intellectual power and its exercise as manifested by them. For in addition to the monotonousness which after awhile becomes

Digitized by Google

apparent in this method of thinking and speaking, there arise constant charges of obscurity, — of thoughts in themselves involved and intricate being put forth in language which is scarcely intelligible, — of studied mistiness and cloudiness of expression,—advancing finally to the assertion, that behind this dark veil there may after all be nothing to be revealed. Undoubtedly, obscurity, intricacy, confusedness, and such like words, are in a measure relative terms; nothing can be understood without that effort of mind which may be necessary to master it; and they who have not so striven have no right to bring a charge of obscurity against one for whose mind the subject, from long acquaintance, possesses no obscurity at all. And with this must be taken into account the force of long continued habit; the mind, associated from early years, it may be, with the custom of stripping subjects of thought of their peculiarities, in order to discern wherein they agree, and of rising from the contemplation of the individual to the properties of the class or genus to which it belongs, has come to give a meaning of its own to particular forms of expression, which therefore to itself fully serve to convey an idea, while at the same time they may seem to others little better than a mere assemblage of words. And even short of this, many a passage which appears strained, obscure, and affected, may have been purposed to express a fixed and definite meaning in the writer's mind;—and might also bear precisely the same and no other meaning in the eyes of another whose mind was of the same mould. This brings us back to a former assertion, that this class employs a language of its own, which may for itself be an adequate vehicle for the expression of its thoughts;—it only remains a question whether, all this being granted, the charge of obscure thought and strained language may not still be pressed against it. We shall be obliged to recur to this subject hereafter; for the present, it may suffice to say that altogether this cast of mind is apparently one which has sprung into existence in these later ages of the world, and that certainly the language employed by it is but the growth of a limited number of years; not indeed that the language of abstract science is of recent origin, but the novelty lies in the ever recurring use of abstract ideas, when speaking even of the most ordinary matters of feeling or intellectual apprehension.

We have lingered, perhaps, too long before entering on our subject, but the foregoing thoughts have been immediately suggested on a comparison of the writings of the two authors whose names are prefixed to this article. Whether the former of the two were capable, if the subject were brought before him, of throwing himself into the regions of the abstract,

(we must almost ask indulgence ourselves for employing such words so often,) or whether his mind, from a more limited range, sought to derive its lessons from the open page of nature, art, or history, apart from the general laws which govern them, clear enough, nevertheless, it seems to be that the mind of the latter author delights in constant generalizations, and that he appears to breathe more freely in the regions of the exalted and the inane, to which others might be disposed to resort at less frequent intervals. While the former writer dwells with a minute and loving carefulness on each component part, for example, of a beautiful landscape, or examines with a searching and delighted eye the leaves and petals of an opening flower, or takes in with greedy ear the mingled sounds of animal life, which seem to speak of existence itself as a delight on a summer's day,—with the latter, it very rarely indeed happens but that, after a short mention of a fact, or slight sketch of a scene, he roams away into general reflections on the original cause or present condition of things, many of which, without much difficulty, might be transferred to other subjects as well as to the one in hand. A more complete contrast in character of mind and language between two writers could scarcely be met with, accompanied as it is with a moral disposition, certainly in more than one point closely corresponding,—a kind of common ground-work, on which have been reared fabrics of strangely different outline and proportion.

As regards this collective edition of their works, the two writers, in one respect, come before the public in different relations: the latter still contemplates further labours, and entertains the hope of sending the results of them forth into the world; Mr. Moir has but recently been taken from the scene of his earthly toil; and while of Mr. Reade we have no further knowledge than what is furnished in the Poems themselves, our judgment of Mr. Moir's poetry must in due measure be influenced by the information which the prefixed Memoir gives us. Of Mr. Reade, in reference more especially to his own sentiments and principles of belief, we must speak, while with all respect, yet with all freedom; for the other, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum;* and, happily, this is an injunction which, in the present case, we have little or no temptation to infringe. While speaking thus, it must not be concluded that the whole system of belief and practice in which Mr. Moir was trained, and in which he lived, is one with which we can profess much sympathy. The member of a body which, regarded in its religious aspect, stands forth to those who are external to it in a light as cold, repulsive, and forbidding as almost any self-chosen religious system can do, and which, regarded intellectually, has from time to time shown its dislike

Digitized by Google

to mental activity, except when exercised in certain approved and authorized directions, we cannot but regard Mr. Moir in his poetic capacity as by no means the genuine growth of the system in which he was involved. Harsh and uninviting in itself as was the scheme of belief set before him, he had from other quarters to borrow warmer hues, and clothe it in more attractive colours. But the man himself comes before us as one who in no ordinary degree did through life his duty in that state to which God had called him, whose eye was ever carried forward into the future, living, as he appears to have done, with a constant and abiding presence of responsibility, with a sense ever of man's weakness, to be overcome and strengthened only by Divine aid; and therefore we own to great regard for his character as presented to us in these volumes. All this, indeed, we might have almost wholly gathered from the Poems themselves; the Memoir, apart from the individual portraiture, is chiefly valuable as throwing light on his mode of composition, and the reasons of the particular forms in which his works are cast, accounting also for the absence of any lengthened and more elaborate poems, as also for the frequent recurrence of similar ideas and passages throughout.

The outlines of Mr. Moir's life may be comprised in the compass of a few words; he was born at Musselburgh, and there his whole life was passed, being educated to the medical profession, in the constant and laborious practice of which his time was continually occupied. The wishes expressed by many of his friends that he should remove to Edinburgh had with him no influence; he was useful to many, and valued where he was: and the prospect of additional reputation was not incitement enough to induce him to leave them. Prosecuting with an untiring energy his medical avocations, the main part of his day he necessarily passed in active exercise, and moving from place to place; and his undeviating rule being, 'business first, and pleasure afterwards,' it is plain how little uninterrupted time he had at his disposal for reading. Late at night, or in his carriage, or for a short time before commencing his daily rounds, he gave what time he could command to pursuits which were foreign to his profession as a physician. And even amongst the products of these leisure moments not the least considerable was itself a medical work, which greatly increased his reputation amongst his colleagues. The bar is known to be very jealous of the devotion of its members to general literature; medicine places its votaries somewhat on a similar footing: but against Mr. Moir no charge of insufficient attention to his immediate work could be brought; what he did, whether in prose or poetry, was accomplished in intervals which most men would have in great

Digitized by Google

measure devoted to mere bodily recreation or idleness. Almost all the poems contained in these volumes are contributions, during a space of upwards of thirty years, to 'Blackwood's Magazine;' most of them being short pieces, and only two or three exceeding some one or two hundred lines in length. It is but fair, therefore, to allow at once that Mr. Moir's poetry must not be weighed in the same balance with the collective works of a poet sent forth by himself in his own life-time. Contributing week after week, and month after month, to the columns of a Magazine, it is difficult, without personal experience of the same thing, to realize how great the temptation to a writer must be, (oftentimes unconsciously influencing him,) to rest contented with a trite thought, or a hackneyed illustration, or sameness of imagery. The contribution of each succeeding number is read, admired, and put aside; it passes away from the reader's memory, it fades away more or less from the writer's also; and after the lapse of some months, or a year or two at most, a poem, very similar in point of thought and expression, may be written by the poet as if it were something entirely new, and received as such by the readers. The mind seems to acquire a habit of manufacturing verses,—there grows up a kind of machinery and apparatus of thought, through which the consecutive subjects must pass; and the chances are numerous enough that one way or another the ready-made and long-accustomed thoughts and illustrations will be found to suit. And all this may be taking place with scarcely any or with no consciousness on the part of the author. It is a danger to which he is necessarily exposed from not having the body of his past writings continually before his eyes; he loses the chance of detecting many a repetition; and manifestly each successive repetition induces a monotony of thought, reducing the writer less or more to the condition of a man (and some such there are) who has finished thinking at a certain time, and for the remainder of his days draws on his already accumulated stock without ever troubling himself to add to it.

It seems difficult in any other way to account for the very frequent recurrence of certain images, illustrations, and even whole courses of thought, in the poetry of a man who, beyond doubt, is deserving of the name of a poet, and some of which we thankfully receive as a contribution worthy to be laid up with the κτήματα ἐς ἀεὶ of which we may already boast: some of it is, as certainly, common-place and ephemeral enough; but yet this must not be suffered to interfere with our estimation of what is really valuable. We have heard of recent critics who, so far from allowing that even Homer himself at times may slumber, seem to go far towards cutting off even those whose

utmost aspiration would be to move at a most humble distance from the mightier masters of song, from this long accustomed indulgence, and appear disposed to maintain, that if the poet's nature be in a man, every page of his writings will alike bear the impress of it, and that there is no need, therefore, to betake ourselves further than any random passage for grounds whereon to form our opinion of his merit. But, so far from thus thinking, we should be almost inclined to assert the converse—that although nine-tenths of a man's work be dross, the remaining portion, if gold, is to be esteemed for gold still; otherwise we should have to reject more than one name at least which now is held in honour. The man who, in strains of such surpassing majesty and grandeur, sang of the heights of Hohen Linden, has also left us abundance of verses which would scarcely be accepted from a school-boy; and not with him only, but, to take another instance, Cowper's 'Ode on the Royal George,' or his 'Lines to Mary,' will serve to redeem many a weary page of sounding words and feeble thought. In the present volumes, however, there is not much that deserves to be rated so very low, although perhaps we shall look in vain for any great instances of sustained power and vigour of writing; we shall find many of the merits and some of the demerits likely to occur in the poems of a man who, to use his own words, 'had 'resolution enough to resolve on a profession, and make poetry 'his crutch and not his staff.' 'I have gained,' he adds, 'many 'domestic blessings which more than counterbalance it, and 'I can yet turn to my pen in my short intervals of occa-'sional relaxation, with as much zest as in my days of romantic 'adolescence.'—(p. lxxxi.)

In reference to his religious life,—living, it would seem, up to the standard set before him in his communion, he yet appears to have been free from that hard sternness which so frequently, more perhaps in former days than now, characterised the zealous adherents of Presbytery. We are informed, that when a very young man he 'joined the communion-table, and was never afterwards a season absent from it;' we also find him for several years a member of the Kirk-Session of Inverness, and more recently representing the burgh of Annan in the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland. Some points of his general belief will present themselves for notice when speaking of his poems; but these facts, taken in connexion with his ordinary work, give us the idea of an amount of activity and energy, in some measure presenting a contrast with the style and character of certain portions of his poetry.

Gentleness, the tenderness of an affectionate disposition, treasuring up the sayings and deeds of those long since taken

from us, and embalming them in an undecaying memory, is certainly the most pleasing and perhaps the most prominent characteristic of Mr. Moir's poetry. The language of real feeling is sure to be impressive; even men of the class which we have before described, the most fond of abstract inquiry and metaphysical discussions, speak, almost involuntarily, a different language when they really come to feel or endeavour to realize the condition of mind of a person in real sorrow and anguish. Apart from this, Wordsworth's proposition, that the language of poetry and prose are identical, becomes an untrue one; but with this, be it poetry or be it prose, we feel as if brought into a universal school, the lessons of which all can learn, and the language of which every one can understand. Possibly in such topics there may be room for not much of originality; but in this sense we may reverently say it, there is nothing new under the sun; and we must still have our sympathies awake for fresh examples of the truth that man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upwards. But in proportion as the sorrow assumes a deeper character, when the grief is that of the husband, the father, or the brother, and therefore in proportion as our own feelings are more warmly affected, in the same proportion the powers of criticism are disarmed; we shrink from minutely examining the words which flow from a broken heart, or enshrine the memory of the loved, the blank of whose absence can never be filled up; we acknowledge the presence as of some sacred power, and we would not irreverently break in upon the stillness and the mournful calm of sorrow. Were Mr. Moir's domestic pieces other than they are, so long as they retained their present pathos, we should not desire to speak harshly of them: as it is, they exhibit all the smoothness and elegance of diction which the best pieces throughout the poems possess. But without further comment, we will cite some portions of a poem entitled 'Casa Wappy' (the self-appellative of a beloved child):—

'And hast thou sought thy heavenly home,
Our fond, dear boy,
The realms where sorrow dare not come,
Where life is joy?
Pure at thy death, as at thy birth,
Thy spirit caught no taint from earth:
Even by its bliss we mete our dearth,
Casa Wappy.

'Thou wert a vision of delight,
To bless us given:
Beauty embodied to our sight,
A type of heaven.

Digitized by Google

So dear to us thou wert,—thou art
Even less thine own self, than a part
Of mine and of thy mother's heart,
Casa Wappy.

'Gem of our hearth, our household pride,
Earth's undefiled,
Could love have saved, thou hadst not died,
Our dear, sweet child.
Humbly we bow to Fate's decree;
Yet had we hoped, that Time should see
Thee mourn for us, not us for thee,
Casa Wappy.

'Do what I may, go where I will,
Thou meet'st my sight:
There dost thou glide before me still,
A thing of light.
I feel thy breath upon my cheek,
I see thee smile, I hear thee speak,
Till, oh! my heart is like to break,
Casa Wappy.

'Methinks thou smil'st before me now
With glance of stealth,
The hair thrown back from thy full brow
In buoyant health:
I see thine eyes' deep violet light,
Thy dimpled cheek carnation'd bright,
Thy clasping arms, so round and white,
Casa Wappy.

* * * * *

'Even to the last, thy every word,
To glad,—to grieve,—
Was sweet as sweetest song of bird
On summer's eve.
In outward beauty undecay'd,
Death o'er thy spirit cast no shade,
And like the rainbow thou didst fade,
Casa Wappy.

'We mourn for thee when blind black night
The chamber fills;
We pine for thee, when morn's first light
Reddens the hills:
The Sun, the Moon, the Stars, the Sea,
All,—to the wall-flower and wild pea,—
Are changed; we saw the world through thee,
Casa Wappy.

'And though, perchance, a smile may gleam
Of casual mirth,
It doth not own, whate'er may seem,
An inward birth.
We miss thy small step on the stair;
We miss thee at thine evening prayer;
All day we miss thee,—everywhere,—
Casa Wappy.

Digitized by Google

* * * * *

'Farewell, then—for awhile farewell—
Pride of my heart;
It cannot be that long we dwell
Thus torn apart.
Time's shadows like the shuttle flee,
And, dark howe'er life's night may be,
Beyond the grave, I'll meet with thee,
Casa Wappy.'—Vol. i. pp. 16—21.

One more quotation from the domestic pieces, and then we must hasten on to other topics. The following is an extract from lines on the death of another son:—

'Fare thee well, our last and fairest,
Dear wee Willie, fare thee well;
God, who lent thee, hath recall'd thee
Back with Him and His to dwell:
Fifteen moons their silver lustre
Only o'er thy brow had shed,
When thy spirit join'd the seraphs,
And thy dust the dead.

'Like a sunbeam, through our dwelling
Shone thy presence bright and calm:
Thou didst add a zest to pleasure,
To our sorrows thou wert balm;
Brighter beam'd thine eyes than summer;
And thy first attempts at speech
Thrill'd our heart-strings with a rapture
Music ne'er could reach.

'As we gazed upon thee sleeping,
With thy fine fair locks outspread,
Thou didst seem a little angel,
Who to earth from Heaven had stray'd;
And entranced, we watch'd the vision,
Half in hope and half affright,
Lest what we deem'd ours, and earthly,
Should dissolve in light.

* * * * *

'Five were ye, the beauteous blossoms
Of our hopes, our hearts, our hearth;
Two asleep lie buried under,
Three for us yet gladden earth.
Thee, our hyacinth, gay Charlie,
Willie, thee our snowdrop pure,—
Back to us shall second spring-time
Never more allure.

'Yet while thinking, oh! our lost ones,
Of how dear ye were to us,
Why should dreams of doubt and darkness
Haunt our troubled spirits thus?
Why across the cold dim churchyard
Flit our visions of despair?
Seated on the tomb Faith's Angel
Says "Ye are not there."

Digitized by Google

* * * * *

'We are wicked, we are weary—
For us pray and for us plead;
God, who ever hears the sinless,
May through you the sinful heed.
Pray that through the Mediator,
All our faults may be forgiven:
Plead that ye be sent to greet us
At the gates of heaven.'—Vol. i. pp. 22—26.

No system of religious belief can exist without dogmas, (even though the dogmatic statement consist only in a negation of all dogmas, it remains itself a dogma still): and Presbyterianism undoubtedly has its own. How far the stanza last cited is the genuine and legitimate growth of the theology of Calvin and John Knox, it is not for us to say; but, in our eyes, it has very much the appearance of a fair plant, transplanted from its parent soil, and blooming far away in an alien country. It is indeed a very beautiful and touching avowal of the communion of saints; and the children of the Church may well hope and believe that the departed do both know of our condition here, and that their prayers are offered for us, even as here below we pray that we with them may attain to the resurrection of the just. And it is matter of thankfulness to find such a hope and belief expressed in quarters where we should little have looked for it. But, indeed, Mr. Moir has raised up a kind of system of his own respecting the condition of the departed in the faith, of which the expressions are constantly recurring. The Church teaches that the dead are sleeping; that, although conscious, and able to pray for themselves and for us, they are still in an inactive state, implied in the very words that 'they rest from their labours,' and that, so far, theirs is not a perfect condition, but that they are waiting for the perfecting, when their bodies shall rise and their souls be again united to them. But it is not so with Mr. Moir; so soon as the breath has departed from the earthly body, so soon do their souls receive a new embodiment, and they become the companions of the ministering angels of God. In the passage last cited the child's spirit is said to have joined the seraphs, and the meaning is elucidated from other passages, as where, speaking of the child first taken from them, he says:—

'Thou leanest where the fadeless wands
Of amaranth bend o'er,
Thy white wings brush the golden sands
Of Heaven's refulgent shore.
* * * * *
'There gush for aye fresh founts of joy,
New rapture to impart;
Oh! dare we call thee still our boy
Who now a Seraph art?'—Vol. i. p. 30.

Google

Again, he traces up their track—

'To where immortal spirits reign,'

and pictures the

'Blessed sight
Unto the angels only given,
Where thy two brothers, robed in light,
Embraced thee at the gates of Heaven.'—Vol. i. p. 35.

And again:—

'A halo glows around thy brow,
The Seraphs are thy playmates now.'—Vol. i. p. 43.

And amidst many like passages we have a picture of Heaven:

'Where by the murmur of silver springs
The Cherubim fold their snow-white wings;
Where those who were sever'd re-meet in joy,
Which death can never more destroy.'—Vol. i. p. 147.

In another poem he thus speaks:—

'Though angel now, thou yet mayst deign
To bend thy radiant look on me.'—Vol. ii. p. 338.

But it is not enough thus to advance them at once to the condition which shall be theirs when the last enemy shall have been destroyed, and the kingdom delivered up to the Father; they are themselves made the ministering angels,—a view very clearly brought out in a piece entitled an 'Address to Little Children,' wherein, having doubtless in his mind the words of our Lord concerning the Angels of the little ones, who always 'behold the face of His Father in Heaven,' he thus writes:—

'Ah, little children, if ye knew
How angel-eyes in love
Look down upon you from the blue
Of the calm skies above,
Ye would be careful what ye do,
And eager to improve.

'A joyous host, a countless band,
In robes of snowy white,
Around the throne, with harp in hand,
Take ever fresh delight,
Young tender souls to their sweet land
To beckon and invite.

'They sorrow o'er you suffering,
They smooth your couch of sleep,
In danger's hour they succour bring,
O'er you a watch they keep;
In you, then, 'twere a cruel thing
To make those blest ones weep.

Digitized by Google

'Each, like yourself, a little child,
Once walk'd this earth beneath,
Saw what you see, and talk'd and smiled;
Till suddenly came death,
And churchyard turf was o'er them piled,
Cold clay, devoid of breath.

'But all the good went up to God,
To dwell with Him for aye;
Their road is now a thornless road,
And bliss is theirs alway:
To golden harps, by Him bestow'd,
They carol night and day.'—Vol. ii. pp. 55, 56.

The difficult question, how the contemplation of the transgressions of men is consistent with the blessedness of the ministering spirits, is one which we do not purpose here to solve; but in this not unattractive, though certainly vague, theology, Mr. Moir seems to have taken refuge from the repulsive coldness of all the accompaniments of the dead in Protestant churchyards. There are few things, perhaps, which, brought before the eye, cause more pain, and awaken more regret, than the sight of graves desecrated and trampled on by men and brutes; no sign to attest that the departed in Christ do sleep in peace, but numberless emblems and signs to tell of an extinguished life, of hopeless sorrow, of a night which knows no morning. Surely in this a lesson may be learnt from the cemeteries of the Roman Church; but more especially do we call to mind the touching affection and loving tenderness, both towards the dead and the living, in the ritual of the Eastern Church, where the blackness and the gloom which here surround the dead as soon as life has departed, there give way before the faith in the resurrection; and the sleeping form is carried to its rest with the song of triumph exceeding joyful in Him who is the conqueror over death and hell. Would indeed that this living present teaching could be brought to bear upon the eyes and hearts of our people; how darksome and forbidding to a thoughtful mind is the present state of things, Mr. Moir will furnish abundant evidence: one instance has been already given; visions of despair flitting across the cold dim churchyard, brought out again in the following contrast:—

'Thy voice was like a summer brook,
For ever singing on;
And everything around thee took
From happiness its tone.
* * * * *
'Thy life was bliss, and can it be
That only now remains for thee
The grave's black horror, the despair
Of silence that endureth there?'—Vol. i. p. 42.

Digitized by Google

The brightness of the noontide sun, the joyousness of spring, only heightens the gloomy contrast as winds on

> 'In sad procession slow the funeral of a child.
> I saw the little coffin borne unto its final rest,
> The dark mould shovell'd o'er it, and replaced the daisied sod.'
> Vol. i. p. 119.

And only once amid the dreary collection of images furnished by 'black rails, memorial-stones, strewed about,' (ii. 27,) vain sorrow over 'funeral urns,' (ii. 277,) 'the churchyard's yellow skull,' (323,) the 'mansion low and lone,' (53,) where 'above their bones unknowing, wild flowers and weeds are growing,' (327,) 'the angled bones, the sand-glass, and the scythe,' (i. 188,) do we meet with a passage which furnishes a pleasing contrast, and that is in telling of a foreign land, where

> 'Verdantly girded, sleeps a placid churchyard,
> With many a cross to scare unholy shapes.'—Vol. ii. p. 174.

It would be well if the same description might be given of all the churchyards of this country.

As might reasonably be expected from a man who shows the loving and reverent feeling manifest in the extracts already given without a disposition to stunt the growth of natural feelings and desires when in accordance with the intimations of Holy Writ, there is a remarkable absence of that narrow-mindedness in religion which results in a continual proneness to sneer at methods and systems to which a man is himself a stranger,—that curious conceit which impels so many with much self-satisfaction to throw aside all consideration of many hundred years, which they are pleased to characterise as times of unmingled ignorance, darkness, and wickedness. Mr. Moir speaks with carefulness and guarded respect even on topics where we might fairly have made allowances for a very different tone,—so as to carry us back to the temper of pieces on similar subjects from the pen of Wordsworth, who stood on a vantage ground in respect of the more definite teaching to which he had access in the English Church. He can dwell with 'a solemn pleasure,' as he 'trode through the shadowy cloistral cells' of Dryburgh, on that pile, as having been—

> 'The abode
> Of men, who could to solitude control
> Their hopes,—yea! from Ambition's pathways stole,
> To give their whole lives blamelessly to God,'—(Vol. i. p. 7,)

in the time when

> 'Night and morn,
> From the near road the traveller heard arise
> The hymn of gratulation and of praise;'—(Vol. i. p. 190,)

Digitized by Google

when—

> 'Veil'd religion
> Bade the calm-brow'd Hermit roam,
> Seeking with the lark and pigeon
> Guilt-untroubled home.
> Truly 'twas an erring choice,
> If (as Reason says) be given
> Earth preparative for Heaven,
> And calm unclouded joys.
> Nobler far 'tis sure to brave
> Every barrier which retards us,
> Than to craven Fear a slave,
> Flee the path that Fate awards us.'—P. 78.

We cannot expect from Mr. Moir a sympathy for the Eremitic life wider than we might be disposed to accord to it ourselves; yet, while leaving without comment the matter contained in this passage, we cannot but advert to the manner in which it is worded, as involving a very dangerous principle; whatever he meant by saying, that Fate awards us our path in life, there is surely risk in allowing Reason to be the judicial tribunal in such a case. Certainly the natural man, guided only by his natural reason, would at once condemn so strange a departure from the ordinary practice of mankind; nay, from like grounds, even higher arguments might be brought against it,—that it defeats its own end, that it is unphilosophical, and the like. Milton advocated the early initiation into a knowledge of evil as a safeguard from being made a prey to the practice of it, on similar reasoning; but specious as all this may be, is it the mode of judgment employed in Holy Writ? Judging by our own reason, we should most probably have lauded Martha and chidden Mary. The pointed rebuke which was given to the former might surely show that there was some principle which, if we may so speak, guided our Lord in that declaration.

But however zealous a son of the Kirk Mr. Moir may have been, we have already shown that his own gentleness of disposition led him in some respects beyond the harsh and meagre dogmatism peculiar to that body; and being, therefore, somewhat at variance with it in his own convictions, we are not surprised to find him occasionally at variance also with himself. The whole tone of his mind appears to have been one, in great part, the growth of a teachable and loving disposition, not prone to useless arguments and disputes, or to a conscious manufacturing of one's own belief; but, theoretically, he was a strenuous asserter of this principle, an exemplification of which occurs in the last cited passage, and was by it betrayed (wonderful were it had it been otherwise) into sundry strange inconsistencies. It is no new thing now; it has been matter of marvel often enough, that, seeing the frightful issues of this principle legitimately deve-

loped, men will yet speak of it as of a pearl of great price; and therefore we can but marvel once more at the fresh instance given us by Mr. Moir. Bearing in mind the untold horrors which continental Europe in times past witnessed from deluded fanatics, and the awful picture of frantic passions and boundless violence exhibited by the Scottish Covenanters, (be it that in its measure they had the palliation of self-defence,) every day multiplying itself with incalculable force, so as to realize in full the terrible delineation given by Bishop Butler of the passion of revenge, it is strange indeed to meet (in the preface to a 'Night Hymn of the Covenanters,' written in a rather similar manner to that of Sternhold and Hopkins,) with a defence of them, which, premising that 'the aggression emanated not from them,' and condemning their tremendous extravagances, still bids us remember 'that the rights they contended for were the most 'sacred and invaluable that man can possess,—the freedom of 'worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience. They 'sincerely believed that the principles which they maintained 'were right; and their adherence to these with unalterable con-'stancy through good report and through bad report,—by the 'blood-stained hearth, on the scaffold, at the stake,—forms a noble 'chapter in the history of the human mind,—of man as an 'accountable creature.' (ii. 292.) Well might we then be proud of those so-termed martyrs, of whom the Arian in olden time gloried, and the Manichee made his boast. Most miserable delusion, the greatest perhaps of which the enemy of mankind has availed himself; nor can we wonder at the zeal wherewith the whole Eastern Church denounces the principle as itself involving all evil; for what can we say, but that in so far as they who avow it are preserved from excess, it is through God's providence in spite of that principle, and not in consequence of it? Nevertheless, Mr. Moir indites for the Covenanters the mild and peaceful declaration—

> 'Never to seek their homes again,
> Never to give the sword its sheath,
> Until our rights of Faith remain
> Unfetter'd as the air we breathe.'—Vol. ii. p. 295.

He exults at the results following the persecutions of those—

> 'Who suffer'd tortures, bonds, and death
> To free from mental thrall the land;'—Vol. ii. p. 347.

and that his lot had fallen 'on days of pleasant calm,' because

> 'In sacred as in civil rights we now
> Are Freedom's children.'—Vol. ii. p. 40.

But, be it so, that this is a treasure of such countless value, and the possession of it so priceless a blessing, such passages read

strangely in contrast with the denunciation of 'Error's clouds, and Ignorance's night,' of 'priesthood bigotry and tyrant thrall,' beneath which 'the wavering tremble and the bold are mute,' as 'thousands fall at the proud stamp of Superstition's foot;' or the anxiety of zeal with which he pens an ode, to prevent these same sacred and inalienable privileges of religious freedom and power of choice, (for the attainment of which he shrinks not from the untold horrors of the Covenanting period,) from being bestowed on the Roman Catholics of this empire at the time of the Emancipation Bill: the attempt, itself, in one of his letters, he terms a detestable one; and in the poetical effusion we have a dreary number of arguments pressed against it,—the evils which have sprung and may again spring from superstition,—we have 'gloomy smoke clouds,' and 'faggots piled,' 'and holy martyrs smiling 'mid lambent tongues of flame,' and the tortures of the Inquisition, and the 'hooded nun' looking out from her prison-house, picturing to herself the 'trysting well,' beside which

> 'Her secret lover wont to wait his burning vows to tell.'
>
> Vol. ii. pp. 4, 5.

Very sad and lamentable, no doubt; but even on his own showing, why may not unfortunate superstition have her own way as well as covenanting zeal? If a man say, I like my chains and I choose them, and prefer being bound to being free, why may not the inalienable privilege of man be extended to him also? The Church, indeed, has her own limits, and those definite and tangible enough, to guard against excesses in either direction; but on every other ground, reason, common sense, and impartial feeling, should dictate that (persuasion failing) the votary of 'dim-eyed superstition' may luxuriate in his bondage as well as the Protestant may cling to his freedom.

It may be almost superfluous to point out other errors,—defective notions, for example, of the natural condition of man, not as first created, but as after the fall, shown by his address, already cited, to his child, as being

> 'Pure at its death as at its birth,'

and occurring in other places also, partly because it is, from the nature of the case, impossible that a man can raise up for himself a thoroughly consistent and well-compacted belief—there must be flaws in it and gaps innumerable—and partly because we shall have occasion to revert to them for a moment when speaking of the poems of Mr. Reade.

We have dwelt long on these several points relating to the author's religious convictions, because, after all, apart from the medium, beautiful or otherwise, which conveys it, the teach-

ing which pervades and the lessons likely to be instilled by it, are the matters of by far the most consequence. A bad principle or an erroneous opinion, prettily given in verse, will, beyond doubt, bear with it more force than the same expressed in ordinary prose; and increase of power in the writing of course adds in proportion to its capabilities for leaving permanent impressions on the mind.

But we gladly turn to other portions of these volumes, where we shall discover the picture of a thoughtful and tender disposition developing itself, although in somewhat of sameness and want of power, yet in a pleasing readiness to avail itself of the teaching which is conveyed by the things that are seen and done around us. From the fact that these are mostly contributions to periodical literature, there are but few pieces amongst them which, from length or form, would challenge an especial observation apart from others; but they may be taken as falling mainly under certain heads, which both serve to show his poetical powers in the best light and bring the man himself before us in a pleasing aspect. His mind appears to have been essentially a retrospective one. The past must, more or less, obtrude itself from time to time on the memories of all; but with many, whether from outward circumstances or from buoyant health, the thought of it comes and passes away again, leaving them, as they were, fully taken up with and content in the present. This class of men furnishes perhaps the fewest poets, and may lay claim, if not to the highest happiness of which the mind is capable, yet perhaps to the smoothest tenor and most equable enjoyment of life. With others, the future displaces both the present and the past; the anticipation of joy or sorrow to come, the likelihood of failure or success, leave the mind in too disturbed a state to appreciate the teaching, whether of nature or of the events of human life. But Mr. Moir seems ever to have been looking back; the present chiefly reminds him that life is different from what it was at starting; the future (as it must needs do with a religious mind) carries his thoughts to the end of this life and the things which follow after it. Undoubtedly the past is the region of poetry; and the man that dwells in the past is, *à priori*, more likely to prove a poet; but something more is needed than the bare consciousness that years pass and life changes as one generation comes up after another. The impressions gained from a contemplation of the past must be varied; we do not like to be ever deriving the same lesson from any object which is capable of giving more. This something Mr. Moir seems to want: we accompany him to the haunts of his youth, to deserted churchyards, to the homes of poets, to

Digitized by Google

crumbling abbeys and shattered castles, to spots wherein only their own silent beauty speaks to us, and to others where we still seem to hear the echoes of mighty deeds which have been acted in them: but wheresoever it be, Mr. Moir touches the same string, and one mournful yet pleasing strain is the result; a pensive dwelling upon past enjoyment, saddened by the thought that they are dead or absent who were the sharers of it,—the changes and chances of this earthly life,—the transitoriness of riches and power and reputation itself,—changes in individuals, changes in nations, the failure of cherished hopes, the realization of anxious fears,—this is the circle in which we have to move. That all the change and the uncertainty of this world, that the pains and sorrows of human life are no one whit overdrawn, we readily acknowledge, but yet there are other things which in their due place and season have a right to be brought forward and dwelt on; and the smoothest diction, the most studied carefulness of composition, the greatest tenderness of thought, will not ward off altogether the feeling of wearisome monotony to which the constant recurrence of the same topics renders us liable. So much does this element of sadness pervade Mr. Moir's poetry, that we should have been led to imagine that pensiveness must have been one of his especial characteristics in daily life, but the memoir furnishes sufficient evidence to the contrary. It must be stated, at the same time, that the method of selection is, in a great measure, answerable for this result; in himself, Mr. Moir seems to have possessed an abundance of mirthful and comic humour, and to have manifested his powers in this way not in prose only, in a most popular and admired work, but very frequently in poetry also; but none of such pieces have been inserted in this collection, and there are not above two or three pieces which bear any signs of a laughter-loving disposition.

The recollections of childhood are especially dear to Mr. Moir; he cherishes, fresh and unimpaired, the memory of youthful rambles and excursions, with each feature of the spots to which they wandered, and the early lessons impressed upon his mind. Healthy and active in body, he was foremost in all active games; of his more quiet recreations, angling was the most prized,—that sport which seems not to shock the humanity of the tenderest minded of mankind. We are not saying that it should do so, but only in order to contrast with it the impression made on him by the kindred sport of shooting. The latter, as that of hunting also, may indeed be far from amenable to the charge of cruelty; at least, we should not wish to press it: the fowls of the air and the beasts of the field are placed at man's disposal; and if any consider the destruction of them a

Digitized by Google

pleasant pastime, there is, perhaps, no reason why they should be kept away from an occupation which, in the case of domestic animals, falls to the lot of the cook or the butcher; but we do think that the pursuit of them is very inconsistent with that gentle tenderness for all things which cannot fail of being its own reward, which loves to see the lark poised on its exulting wing, and can listen to its ascending song, without the wish to see it lying bleeding and mangled at his feet. The sensibility of Cowper in this respect may be set aside as a morbid one, but we own to a feeling of satisfaction on finding that such were the thoughts, impressed by a precisely similar occasion, on a man strong in body as in mind, delighting in all active and manly pastimes, without anything which the world might be tempted to laugh down as mawkish squeamishness. The poem which narrates this contains also some pictures beautifully drawn, and will justify our extracting a portion of it. The writer speaks of times when he was

> 'A little boy, and earth the realm of fairy-land.'

He sets off on a shooting excursion with a fowler, who was a visitor at his home, and whose joy he describes:—

> 'The passion which lit up his brow, to con
> The feats of sleight and cunning skill, by which
> Their haunts were neared, or on the heathy hills,
> Or mid the undergrove, on snowy moor,
> Or by the misty lake, what time the dawn
> Reddens the east, or from on high the moon
> In the smooth water sees her pictured orb,
> The white cloud slumbering in the windless sky,
> And midnight mantling all the silent hills.'

It is early morning, still and calm—

> 'There was no breath abroad; each in its cave
> As if enchanted slept the winds, and left
> Earth in a voiceless trance; around the porch
> All stirlessly the darksome ivy clung;
> All silently the leafless trees held up
> Their bare boughs to the sky; the atmosphere,
> Untroubled in its cold serenity,
> Wept icy dews; and now the later stars,
> As by some hidden necromantic charm
> Dilate amid the death-like calm profound
> Upon the slumber-mantled earth look down.
> * * * * *
> In the far west the Pentland's gloomy ridge
> Belted the pale blue sky, whereon a cloud
> Fantastic, grey, and tinged with solemn light,
> Lay, like a dreaming monster; and the moon,
> Waning, above its silvery rim upheld
> Her horns, as 'twere the spectre of the past.

Digitized by Google

Silently, silently, on, on we trode,
As if a spell had frozen up our words:
White lay the woods around us, ankle deep
In new fallen snow, which champ'd beneath our tread;
And by the marge of winding Eske, which show'd
The mirror'd stars upon its map of ice,
Downwards in haste we journey'd to the shore
Of ocean, whose drear multitudinous voice
Unto the listening spirit of silence sang.

* * * * *

'Twere sad to tell our murderous deeds that morn:
Silent upon the chilly beach we lay
Prone, while the drifting snow-flakes o'er us fell
Like Nature's frozen tears for our misdeeds
Of wanton cruelty. The eider-ducks,
With their wild eyes and necks of changeful blue,
We watch'd now diving down, now on the surge
Flapping their pinions, of our ambuscade
Unconscious, till a sudden death was found;
While floating o'er us, in the graceful curves
Of silent beauty, down the sea-mew fell:
The gilimot upon the shellbank lay
Bleeding, and oft in wonderment its mate
Flew round with mournful cry to bid it rise,
Then shrieking fled afar: the sand-pipers,
A tiny flock, innumerable, as round
And round they flew, bewail'd their broken ranks,
And the scared heron sought his inland marsh.
With blood-bedabbled plumes around us rose
A slaughter'd hecatomb; and to my heart
(My heart then open to all sympathies)
It spoke of tyrannous cruelties, of man
The desolator: and of some far day,
When the accountable shall make account,
And but the merciful shall mercy find.
Soul-sicken'd, satiate, and dissatisfied,
An altered being homewards I return'd,
My thoughts revolting at the thirst for blood,
So brutalizing, so destructive of
The finer sensibilities which man
In boyhood owns, and which the world destroys.
Nature had preach'd a sermon to my heart,
And from that moment, on that snowy morn,
(Seeing that earth enough of suffering has
And death) all cruelty my soul abhorr'd,—
Yea, loathed the purpose and the power to kill.'—Vol. i. p. 72.

It is in these, the recollections, pleasant or sorrowful, of his early days, that Mr. Moir's poems exhibit the freshness, purity, and simplicity of his mind. We have not, indeed, as we have before noticed, much indication of great power, but his life was thoroughly taken up with the discharge of active duties, and a happy and contented mind did not often lead him into profound and abstruse inquiries; but whenever his own personal reminiscences are told to us, there is always a most pleasing fresh-

ness of thought, with smoothness and elegance of style; and indeed we may divide all the poems into two classes,—the one containing the description of his own personal feelings and recollections, or actions or events which in some way had reference to himself; the other being (in a stricter sense of the term than the ordinary one) fancy pieces. Amongst those of the latter class are a great number apparently addressed by the poet to an imaginary person; and there seems a very great likelihood that such pieces will not only fall into a great monotony of treatment, but also will show very great unreality. It is otherwise in a set tale; there the several characters speak in their own persons, and the circumstances in which they are placed furnish the clue to the particular strain of thought; but there is no such guide for us when we meet with poems addressed to 'Inez in absence,' to 'Inez in remembrance;' or effusions 'On the Death of Ida;' and we are driven to suppose that they are facts belonging to his own history, and that he was of the number of those who have to look back on the memory of some absent or departed one, with whom had he

> 'Never met and never parted,
> He had ne'er been broken-hearted;'

but the narrative of his life precludes this supposition. Married at a comparatively early period of life, he seems to have been united to the object of his first love, from whom he was never afterwards separated; so that, in default of this hypothesis, we are led to conclude (and the sameness of style the more inclines us so to do) that the writer sat down to compose verses to some one whom he imagined himself to have loved and lost; and how can a man be well expected (unaided by the concurring circumstances of a tale which may really rouse his sympathy and enable him in a degree to realize the requisite state of feeling) to create in his own heart a blank, making life a void, and to delineate sorrows in himself which do not exist? A man, happy in his love, and happy in his home, may easily narrate the sufferings of the broken-hearted; but he can scarcely, without becoming unreal, attempt to make himself the subject of those same feelings. It is easier, perhaps, to realize an imaginary condition of sorrow than of joy; but to realize either fully, there must be personal experience, or else the writer must distinctly set before himself some other person from whom those feelings are to be described as coming. But this sameness occurs, not only in the kind of poems just mentioned, but also in most of the pieces suggested by celebrated Scottish localities. These are little more than either mere glorifications of great deeds done, or more frequently, meditations on the lapse of

time and the changes consequent, and pictures of the sorrow and misery resulting, whether on defeat or victory.

> 'We'll hear nae mair lilting at the ewe milking,
> Women and bairns are heartless and wae,
> Sighing and moaning on ilka green loaming,
> The flowers of the forest are a' wede away;'

is a touching picture of what must be the sequel of every battle-field; but there is sameness, nevertheless, when we find that one field suggests almost the same train of thoughts with another; and the charge remains, whatever be the merits of the versification. This we have already mentioned as being almost always very smooth, careful, and polished; but we must be suffered to say a few words on the subject of rhyme and rhythm. The present school of poets seems to have paid especial attention to the latter; no one more so than Mr. Tennyson; and it seems to us that this elaborate and guarded carefulness that there shall never be a break in the rhythm, no one line with a different scanning or cæsura from another, is one of the means which produce the great smoothness of his poetry, while, at the same time, they take off from its power. But Mr. Tennyson, so careful in rhythm, is not always equally guarded as to his rhymes; a defect which to us seems greater than an occasional halting or ruggedness in the lines themselves. The subject is one which, so far as we can judge, does not seem to have engaged Mr. Moir's attention; but a naturally musical ear has prevented either much harshness in his pieces, or much bad rhyming. There are certainly occasional blemishes,—cæsuras in the wrong foot, adjectives occurring at the end of a line with their substantives in the following one, but more frequently in the matter of rhymes,—for we cannot consider, as such, collocations like the following; 'thwarts—departs;' 'claws—was,' and many others; such rhymes as 'childhood' with 'wildwood' are questionable;—but infelicity of rhyming cannot very well exceed that of the following stanza:—

> 'And art thou gone? I deem'd thee some
> Immortal essence,—art thou gone?
> I saw thee laid within the tomb,
> And I am left to mourn alone;
> Once to have loved, is to have loved
> Enough; and what with thee I proved,
> Again I'll seek in none;'—(vol. ii. p. 236;)

which, strictly speaking, is blank verse; and this defect is a far worse one than a verse halting or broken; the unvarying sameness of cadence, in Mr. Tennyson's poetry for example, is by no means inviting; it seems an iron bondage, which in the ten

Digitized by Google

syllable line, for instance, would limit us to a succession of iambics, condemning the rhythm of such a line as

'O'er the glad waters of the dark blue sea,'

and seeking to keep us to such a monotone as is furnished by much of Gray's Elegy. Surely a cadence occasionally varied may be of great service, if not employed so often as to degenerate into a fault.

But we do not wish to be understood as speaking of Mr. Moir in a tone of depreciation: gladly, therefore, in parting with him, we turn to dwell upon his beauties only,—his love for the sights and sounds of nature, his tenderness for all living things. We catch the tone of that thought in Wordsworth's exquisite ode,

'Yet I know
Where'er I go,
That there hath passed away a glory from the earth,'

in the following lines on the Harebell:—

'Though it be that now thou art
But as a memory to my heart,—
Though years have flown, and in their flight
Turn'd hope to sadness, bloom to blight,
And I am changed,—yet thou art still
The same bright blossom of the hill,
Catching within thy cup of blue
The summer light and evening dew:
Yea, though the wizard Time hath wrought
Strange alteration in my lot,
Though what unto my youthful sight
Appear'd most beautiful and bright,
(The morning star, the silver dew,
Heaven's circling arch of cloudless blue,
And setting suns above the head
Of ragged mountains blazing red,)
Have of their glory lost a part,
As worldly thoughts o'erran the heart,
Still, what of yore thou were to me,
Blithe boyhood seeks and finds in thee;—
As on the sward reclined he lies,
Shading the sunshine from his eyes,
He sees the lark with twinkling wings
For ever soaring as she sings,
And listens to the tiny rill
Amid its hazels murmuring still,
The while thou bloomest by his knee.'—Vol. i. p. 150.

His favourite subject of change and decay is pleasingly brought before us in the following lines to the Sycamine:—

'The frail yellow leaves, they are falling
As the wild winds sweep the grove:
Plashy and dank is the sward beneath,
And the sky it is grey above;

Digitized by Google

Foaming adown the dark rocks,
Dirge-like the waterfall
Mourns as if mourning for something gone
For ever beyond its call.
* * * *
Sing, Redbreast, from the russet spray;
Thy song with the season blends,
For the bees have left us with the blooms,
And the swallows were summer friends.
* * * *
Oh the shouts and the laughter of yore,
How the tones wind round the heart!
Oh the faces blent with youth's blue skies!
And could ye so depart?
The crow screams back to the wood,
And the seamew to the sea:
And earth seems to the foot of man
No resting place to be.'—Vol. ii. p. 290.

The following is a beautiful picture of peacefulness and repose:—

'O'er the Esk
. . . . . the hawthorn hung
Its garland of green berries, and the bramble
Trail'd mid the camomile its ripening fruit;
With many a gush of music, from each brake
Sang forth the choral linnets; and the lark,
Ascending from the clover field, by fits
Soar'd as it sang, and dwindled from the sight.
The cushat stood amidst the topmost boughs
Of the tall trees, his white-ring'd neck aslant,
Down through the leaves to see his brooding mate.
Mid the tall meadow grass the ox reclined,
Or bent his knee, or from beneath the shade
Of the broad beech with ruminant mouth gazed forth.
Rustling with wealth, a tissue of fair fields
Outstretch'd to left and right in luxury;
And the far forests on the upland slopes
Contrasted darkly with the golden grain.'—Vol. ii. p. 353.

But, perhaps, the passages of greatest beauty are the descriptions of the several times of morning, evening, and night;—the following is a perfect picture:—

'Twas the flush of dawn, on the dewy lawn
Shone out the purpling day;
The lark on high sang down from the sky,—
The thrush from the chestnut spray:
On the lakelet blue, the watercoot
Oared forth with her sable young;
While at its edge, from reed and sedge
The fisher hern upsprung;
In peaceful pride, by Esk's green side,
The shy deer stray'd through Rosslin glen;
And the hill fox to the Roman camp
Stole up from Hawthornden.'—Vol. ii. p. 155.

Digitized by Google

Another, equally graphic, is where, from the Slopes of Inveresk, he

> 'gazed down
> Upon the frith of Forth, whose waveless tide
> Glow'd like a plain of fire. In majesty
> O'er-canopied with many-vestured clouds,
> The mighty sun, low in the furthest West,
> With orb dilated, o'er the Grampian chain
> Mountain up-piled on mountain, huge and blue,
> Was shedding his last rays adown the shores
> Of Fife, with all its towns and woods and fields,
> And bathing Ben Ean and Benledi's peaks
> In hues of amethyst. Ray after ray,
> From the twin Lomond's conic heights declined
> And died away the glory; and at length,
> As sank the last low horizontal beams,
> And twilight drew her azure curtain round,
> From out the South twinkled the evening star.'—Vol. ii. p. 360.

We could easily and gladly give many other descriptions of equal merit, scattered through these poems, but that our space warns us to hurry on. Passages of greater force and power we do not think they contain, but we linger with pleasure in the company of a poet who so walks and converses with nature, not only noting all her changes and characteristics, but who draws lessons so healthful and so true from her teaching, who discerns that

> 'Meanings profounder, loftier lie
> In all we see, in all we hear,
> Than merely strike the common eye,
> Than merely meet the careless ear.
> And meekly man must bend his knee
> On Nature's temple floor, if he
> Would master her philosophy.'—Vol. i. p. 141.

It is no disparagement that a mightier poet has set forth the same truth before. Ages and men have alike their office to perform; and a careful examination and minute and loving portraiture of the things that are seen and heard around us is perhaps the chief characteristic of our more recent poetry; and in so far, therefore, it is accomplishing a good work.

Thus then we take leave of a man, in the perusal of whose poems we have spent many a pleasant hour; feeling thankful that an example of so much gentleness, humility, and reverence, has been furnished to us by a religious system from which such growths are unfortunately but too rare; and in taking leave of him, we cannot help citing his own opinion on the subject of which the opening remarks of this article have treated. 'De-'pend upon it,' is an expression in one of his letters, 'whenever 'a writer is obscure, he is weak; and when you do come to a 'hidden meaning, it is not worth knowing.' Were this maxim

Digitized by Google

to be applied at once in its full force to Mr. Reade's poetry, the sentence passed on it must needs be a hard one; but obscurity and mystery are ugly sounding words, and, therefore, before charging a writer with them, it is fitting to know precisely what meaning we attach to them. Obscurity, after all, as we before noticed, is but a relative term; and it is impossible that every subject can be treated of with the same clearness and easiness. Some questions are in their own nature more abstruse than others; and no charge of obscurity in such subjects can be entertained when coming from persons who never think at all.

Such was the defence against this same charge of the greatest perhaps of our moral philosophers, when desirous of explaining whom he considered fit judges whether his arguments 'might have been put in a plainer manner;' 'which yet,' he adds, 'I am very far from asserting that they could not.' And, therefore, it might be urged, in defence of Mr. Reade, that he has to treat of subjects in themselves involving great difficulty and wrapped in great obscurity. But this allegation must be itself discussed in its own place; we must examine whether the subjects treated of are really so very dark and dimly known as they are in these volumes represented to be; meanwhile we revert to the judgment of the same writer on morals, from whom we have quoted, that, 'it is very unallowable for a work of imagination or entertainment not to be of easy comprehension.' The entertainment, perhaps, which the present writer would set before his readers, may be of a more recondite character; and therefore we would desire to the very utmost to allow for the obscurity attendant on the medium of language which conveys it.

We have already mentioned the very strong contrast apparent between Mr. Reade and Mr. Moir, and taken them as examples of two entirely different types of intellectual development, of minds which are perpetually apt to look at the same object in very different aspects. It is not unreasonable therefore to look for a corresponding difference between them in point of style and language; and, also, before pressing any charge of unintelligible or harsh or obscure wording, we desire to bear in mind the caution of perhaps the greatest and best critic in matters of poetry, (however his own practice may have differed from his rules,)—we mean Wordsworth,—'that the critic ought 'never to forget that he himself is exposed to the same errors 'as the poet, and perhaps in a much greater degree; for there 'can be no presumption in saying of most readers, that it is not 'probable they will be so well acquainted with the various 'stages of meaning through which words have passed, or with 'the fickleness or stability of the relations of particular ideas to

Digitized by Google

'each other.' But it has been already allowed that men of this abstract and argumentative stamp of mind may very possibly use expressions which seem strange and obscure to others, attaching to them a real meaning, and that this meaning may be a fixed one in their own minds; and therefore it would be necessary to look with all deference on apparently misty passages, and to ponder well whether the defect be in the writer, or rise from one's own want of acquaintance with the particular idea. In other words, poetry in which this kind of thought abounds, entails on the unlearned in this branch the acquisition of a separate science, in default of a lexicon which may at once settle the meaning of words as employed by such writers. Yet after all we must be permitted to ask one question:—How far is it right to introduce so much obscurity, so much of difficult and abstruse thought into poetry? nay rather, how far is it consistent with the existence of poetry itself? The poet seeks to have weight with other men, to influence them, to move them; and so far as he is one, he succeeds in so doing, because, in Wordsworth's admirable description, 'he is a man speaking to 'men,—a man, it is true, endowed with a more lively sensibility, 'more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge 'of human nature and a more comprehensive soul, than are 'supposed to be common among mankind; a man pleased with 'his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than 'other men in the spirit of life that is in him,—delighting to 'contemplate similar volitions and passions as manifested in the 'goings on of the universe, and habitually impelled to create 'them where he does not find them.' And just for this very reason he must speak as other men speak; he must give utterance to his thoughts in a language intelligible, not only to himself and to men of a precisely similar mind with himself, because, to cite the same great judge, 'Poets do not write for 'poets alone, but for men; unless therefore we are advocates 'for that admiration which subsists upon ignorance, and that 'pleasure which arises from hearing what we do not understand, 'the poet must descend from this supposed height; and, in 'order to excite rational sympathy, must express himself as 'other men express themselves.' But it is time that we should show what we mean with respect to the present poems.

There is a phraseology, of which we are not aware that many specimens exist of more than recent date, at all events among English writers; the metaphysical Germans appear to have been mainly instrumental in rearing the fabric, so far as hardness of style and diction and continual abstractions are concerned; its introduction into English literature may, in a very great degree, be laid at the doors of Mr. Carlyle. We own to

Digitized by Google

no great liking for the continual personification of abstract qualities, or pleasure in receiving such information as that Abject Fear, looking out of the window, beholds Consternation prostrate upon the pavement. We cannot admire the exceeding harshness, stiffness, and frigidity of style resulting from it; when driven to the perusal of it, we are, as it were, walking in a strange land,—the plants and trees are of uncouth and fantastic growth, the very skies assume a different hue, the clouds a different form, and the human habitants therein live in a world of thought of which we can scarcely consider ourselves the denizens. This phraseology, whether adopted from others, or the growth of his own mind, is the staple of Mr. Reade's diction. It occurs in such profusion, that it is impossible to do more than to give a few almost random instances,—compound words, such as 'thought-utterances,' (i. 15,) 'ray-emanations,' 'knowledge-thankfulness,' (ii. 294,) 'winds cloud-folded,' 'cloud-congregations,' (ii. 336,) 'sense-penance,' (i. 207,) 'heart-emanations,' (i. 58,) 'heart-flowers,' 'man-image,' (i. 212,) and divers others. It is difficult to see why Greek and German idioms should be foisted on the unwilling English language. It so happens that the Greek use of the article and substantive, embracing a number of words between them, is also the German usage; yet it would not be pleasant to come across such an expression in our own tongue as, for example, 'the by the Persians against the Greeks boldly carried on war;' yet in itself the latter seems little more ridiculous than these newly-coined compound words. Of what has, before now, received the name of Adverbial Philosophy there also is abundance; plenty of 'the beautiful,' 'the bodiless all,' 'the indwelling,' 'the inane,' 'the known,' 'the unknown,' 'the understood,' 'the uncompromising real,' 'the ineffable,' 'the unchangeable,' 'the mutable,' 'the one,' 'the now and then.' Some of these, as 'the mutable,' are presented in every possible shape,—

> 'Forms whose name is mutability.'—i. 117.

Memnon

> 'Stands above the uproar,
> Calm, lofty, massive, and immutable.'—i. 235.

Prometheus on the rock is

> 'Stern, rigid, motionless, immutable.'—i. 277.

Yet again the change is rung on the same sounds,—

> 'We live
> Among things mutable: what else our lives?
> But mutability is the robe of life
> That vestures the immutable.'—ii. 353.

Digitized by Google

But it would be superfluous to multiply examples, such as

> 'The throbbing pulse of mutability,' &c.

Another very favourite word is 'humanity,' or more frequently in the plural number; as, for instance, Memnon says,—

> 'Fallen as we are, we have not
> Forgotten our humanities;'—(i. 226;)

which most unwillingly forces on our memory the course of studies pursued by Dugald Dalgetty at the Marischal College of Aberdeen. We are told to

> 'Live among humanities.'—i. 304.

> 'Humanities bind man to the universal soul of human kind.'—ii. 386.

Again;

> 'Our confessional another lacks
> Ere we compare humanities.'—ii. 334.

The ambition of Prometheus

> 'Could not descend into the pale of our humanities,' &c. &c.—i. 277.

A volcano is said to

> 'Tongue red fires.'—ii. 96.

Seas are 'entempested;' pride 'in safe distance spheres its impotence;' the soul is spoken of as 'spread o'er the metropolitan world,' (ii. 314;) we are said to be 'slaves to motiving necessity,' (ii. 323;) praise and blame, virtue and vice, are 'sounds of signs made powers,' (ii. 324.) Men gazing on a sunset, 'felt its beauty entering their visual being.' (ii. 370.) But it is needless to multiply examples further, of words strangely compounded, or employed in unusual meanings. Most probably, in the issue, the English language will vindicate itself from such alien usages and combinations, and this array of newly-born phrases sink into the 'measureless inane;' a far greater blot is the incorrectness of style which accompanies them. The rules of grammar are sufficiently stringent in prose; we have not learnt that they may be dispensed with in poetry, and that the latter will admit an endless assemblage of ellipses, will suffer verbs, relatives, participles, conjunctions, to be left out at the will of the writer; yet there is scarcely a page of these volumes that does not furnish several instances of one or more of these omissions and solecisms. Participles are omitted in absolute constructions:—

> 'I have mused among grey wrecks of men,
> Unknown the hands that rear'd.'—ii. 281.

> 'Feeding on the outward forms
> Of beautiful things, their inner meaning veil'd.'—ii. 287.

Digitized by Google

> 'Spiritual vision faded, I have felt,
> Facile ascent by winged impulse won
> Immortal natures only may attain.'—ii. 303.

This last passage furnishes an example of one of the most abundant classes of omissions, that of the relative: Mr. Reade seems to have a singular dislike to that part of speech; ordinary usage permits us, both in prose and poetry, to dispense with it under certain limitations, but many a passage is here rendered most harsh and obscure by the omission. We will cite but a few instances, but they are curious enough:—

> 'It is the moral beauty my soul knows
> She hath won invests her;'—i. 243;

in which are omitted two relatives and a conjunction.

> 'I essay'd my will,
> Poised motives, the suspended balance held.'—ii. 323.

> 'The indulgence were withheld, I claim from you
> But that,' &c.—ii. 364.

> 'Assume the resignation we aspire
> From knowledge of our life inscrutable.'—ii. 369.

The article is omitted with disagreeable frequency, of which one instance may suffice,—

> 'Fear watch'd to see dispersed
> Tempest whose breath withheld,' &c.

With one or two examples of miscellaneous omissions we will end:—

> 'If to know Him the happiness ye ask'd,
> Wherefore from Eden brutelike were ye driven?
> Why thou the hopeless thing I found thee here?'—i. 19.

> 'We prove life's truths too late, the change in us,
> Till become opposites of what we were.'—i. 313.

> 'Who hath not felt and own'd
> Our union with nature as with man?
> She ever the oracular shrine of truth,
> Inspiring her believers, glow of love
> To revelations of the beautiful,
> Feeling our kin affinities; to men
> Peace, and a harmony with the moral world,
> Blended by unremember'd notes, yet woven
> Within our being, sacrifice of self,
> That brought its own reward and happiness,
> Reflecting others' joy.'—ii. 354.

Perhaps this whole passage has its meaning; and possibly, were the various omissions in it supplied, we might be able to apprehend that meaning; as it is, we cannot pretend to have mastered it; we grope our way dimly, catching something which yet again seems to elude our grasp. We almost shrink

Digitized by Google

from the astonishing number of harsh passages, and passages ambiguous and obscure, and some, we confess, to us utterly unintelligible. Once more we must repeat what has been already cited, that poets do not write for poets alone, but for men; and we only desire to claim our fair share of consideration, when we assert that we have given every one of these passages a diligent and earnest attention; we have taken some of them one way and then another, oftentimes altogether in vain; in many of them, whether from the frequent ellipses or from the abstruseness of the ideas, the constant abstract images, or from strange combinations of words, it might be difficult to tell,—but the very words, as they stand forth in type, assume the character of dissolving views, and seem to bear a different meaning every time that the eye rests upon them. We must cite a few instances, at the risk of being wearisome. What are we to make of the harmony and perspicuity of the following?

> 'Patroclus risen sunlike, blazing in Pilides' arms array'd,
> The rally, rout, the lightning hero by the Lycian monarch stay'd,
> The sire God veil'd his prescient vision,' &c.—i. 89.

Language could scarcely be harsher than—

> 'So time rolls on; states, faiths trace paths renew'd;'—(ii. 58;)

or than—

> 'The human flowers,—
> For what love, hope, faith, but flowers we cherish?
> Blighted,' &c.—(ii. 299.)

or more obscure than the following:—

> '*Cain.* What were these broken masses rounded like
> The trunks of trees, of dazzling whiteness, traced
> With unknown imagings?
> *Lucifer.* The pillars of the dwellings of earth's kings,
> Built to impress substantial memories
> On breath of men; to stamp on mutable clay
> A power and feeling of the immutable;
> Man's pride reveal'd, wrestling with destiny
> All vainly; but in softer hearts a yearning
> Toward those left; a sigh to leave behind
> But human memories; thou seest the crowns
> They wore, when man bow'd down and worshipped them.'—i. 51.

Whatever be the meaning of the whole, it is not easy to see how a memory can be impressed on the breath. Or again (speaking of Prometheus):—

> 'What his reward for all he taught and suffer'd?
> The worn-out hope, the fear, the doubt, despair
> Returning on him still, rocklike repelled
> By that impenetrable spirit. These
> The harvests, whose vain sweat were drops of blood;

Digitized by Google

This the base height attained to open on
Waste desolation, the Tantalean thirst
Unslaked that lives beyond the grave,
The fabled vultures that do prey upon
Engenderings of the heart which they have baffled.'—i. 277.

We confess the passage baffles us. With equal obscurity does the writer speak of the extinction of the Greek mythology :—

'They live no more, those idols of the heart,
Those earliest abstractions of our thought,
Pure offspring of the soul's immortal part,
That animated life material wrought
From its own quickening essence over-fraught
Into the beautiful with which it strove;
The emanation from founts unforgot,
Creation of the soul's o'erflowing love,
That bodied earthly Gods from archetypes above.'—ii. 81.

Again, we are told, on the same subject, that

'Sun-haired Apollo sinks from his red car;
Progressive faculty the God had found,
Whose shadow was his glory.'

But there are many others, where we fail of discerning even the partial meaning which we perceive in those already given. The poet is speaking of the arch of Titus, and asks,—

'Deem ye the Hebrew slave who graved his tale
Of slavery there, felt not his creed should still prevail;
That the mock'd symbols of a faith accursed
Should crown yon altar places desolate,
The fondest, latest by religion nursed:
When Truth should point her path to heaven, and Fate
Become a word to raise the smile sedate;
When the gods multiform should bow to one?
Lo! there the victors on the vanquish'd wait;
The secrets of their creed revealed in stone,
Once heathens' scorn and gibe while lightly passing on.'—ii. 57.

And yet more—:

'Oh, little do the cold world apprehend
The anticipating fear, hope, conscious doubt
Of youthful aspiration! restless yearning
For fame, whose aching thirst is happiness:
The entrance in her temple, awe-impress'd
By the sedate and solemn potencies
Enthroned there; brows the records high
And august thought that made of human names
Virtues, the consciousness of distance felt.'—291.

And in similar way:—

'Yet I fed meditation, watching sin:
I gazed upon the face, until the eye,
Projecting light, the tongue that falsehood phrased,

Digitized by Google

> And liveried subtleties came forth unheard;
> Then while with vision open'd I look'd in
> The speaker's visible soul,—then while I loathed
> The human tree whereon I grew.'—ii. 297;

And likewise:—

> 'It was upon a winter's stormy night
> Her missive came to see myself and daughter;'—(ii. 362,)

(which, from the sequel, is shown to mean, 'Her missive came, saying, that she wished to see myself and my daughter.')

We could fill many a page with examples of a like kind, but the foregoing may suffice to show how obscure the writing of this author can be. Obscurity is almost sure to involve harshness; and whenever Mr. Reade speaks after the manner of Mr. Carlyle, he is always harsh and cramped in his diction, as well as very frequently uncouth and inelegant in his versification. There are frequent instances of infelicitous rhymes, as in a Spenserian stanza, 'forth,' 'wrath,' 'worth,' and 'path,' are supposed to rhyme with each other. But Mr. Reade has also many peculiarities of prosody; words occur scanned differently in different places. Sometimes he gives 'vĭbrātĕst,' sometimes 'vībrătēst;' sometimes 'cōntĕmplātĭng,' at others, 'cŏntēmplătīng;' 'hour,' 'flower,' 'heaven,' and other words, almost invariably counted for monosyllables, are scanned as two; 'frailty' almost always occurs as a trisyllabic word; and more strangely still, we meet with 'inspiring' and 'enkindling' as words of four syllables, as in—

> 'A spirit here, its ruin shall outlast,
> Inspiring the air; the skeleton,' &c.—ii. 53.

As also there are several strange expressions, as—

> 'Earthly passion that its throne hath chose.'—ii. 75.

'Laid, is put for 'lay:'—

> 'We had rounded the ribb'd hill,
> Where opening from beneath a valley laid,
> Embosom'd among mountains.'—(ii. 335.)

or for 'lain,' as—

> 'Thou hast pass'd,—
> Lo, how thy shadow on the ground hath laid!'

And there are several such as the following:—

> 'So did he feel how vain
> To realize his boyhood's hope again,
> Till refuging from self-made tyranny,'—ii. 109.

'Forsook' is given for 'forsaken;' again there is—

> 'Died for such as me.'—ii. 339.

Digitized by Google

It is from no feeling of pleasure that we have dwelt on this whole subject; but we wished at once to show, and, having shown, to put aside the mention of the ruggedness, harshness, obscurity, and sometimes utter darkness, of much of Mr. Reade's poetry; we wished to notice (without digressing to blemishes of form or language) those passages which show forth real power and beauty; and, most of all, we wish to approach, without hindrance, the most important topic of all,—the examination of Mr. Reade's moral and religious philosophy.

We have said already that there appear to be points of resemblance between the moral dispositions of Mr. Reade and Mr. Moir. The eyes of both are open to take in all that is spread out before them in the works of God's hands, their ears to listen to the—

> 'Inward melody
> Caught from earth, and sea, and sky.'—i. 388.

There is in both the same keen appreciation of all that is beautiful or touching in nature, however different, for the most part, may be the trains of thought into which they severally are led; and with this there is the same gentleness of character and tenderness for all living things. It is scarcely necessary to prove this by instances; but the coincidence occasionally is very noticeable, as where, looking on a bird's-nest—

> 'Girt as with a mossy vest,'

the former feels—

> 'That the weakest thing that lives
> Claims the freedom nature gives;
> That doth ask protection less,
> From its own defencelessness,
> Or the beauty still appealing
> To our nature's answering feeling,
> Than the law which doth belong
> To the weak against the strong.'—ii. 383.

Again, we note the same loving minuteness in the portraiture of—

> 'The ever loved, the ever joyous flowers,
> Whose blossomings are laughter; there the rose
> Languidly her dew-dropping cheek declined,
> Her name a blessing sanctified by love
> And child-remembrances. The marigold
> Open'd her gorgeous beauty to the sun,
> O'er-veiling when he sets, to be look'd on
> By no inferior eye. There radiate shone
> Through cloudiest green the starlike jessamine;
> Irises drooping in the luxury
> Of a fine sorrow, their blue orbs half closed:
> The azalea lean'd against the soft grey wall,
> There paled the delicate anemone,
> Turning away her sweet head from the wind.'—ii. 276.

But if he is minute in describing their form, he is no less careful to imbibe their teaching:—

> 'I have felt
> In all their gentleness they have a voice
> Deeper than that of mountains or of floods;
> Life's opening germ, youth's blossoming, decline
> And fall of age their holy lips reveal;
> They teach us how to live, and how to die,
> Shedding their purity on us with their breath:
> There quaffs the insect from his cup, and parts
> Contented: there the sacred dews of heaven
> Are caught and cherished; when their hour is done
> They quietly surrender up to Nature
> Their beautiful being.'—ii. 276.

It is remarkable, that on such subjects, and on all where he gives utterance to the genuine feelings of the heart, there is almost a total absence of the harsh, strained, and obscure diction, with dark and almost unintelligible thought, which elsewhere germinates in such rank fertility. In vigour of thought, indeed, and power of language, Mr. Reade far surpasses Mr. Moir; and where he deigns to descend from the lofty heights of abstract research, we have passages of mingled beauty and strength, deserving to be ranked amongst the highest efforts of the poetic mind; the most remarkable, perhaps, being in the delineation of the affections of love, or gentleness, or sorrow; and of which we shall have occasion to notice some instances of almost faultless elegance and sweetness. Both the poets, also, have the same theory regarding the permanent authority of human reason, as the fountain-head from which all belief springs, and the ultimate tribunal from whose decisions there is no appeal; but with this important practical difference,—that Mr. Moir professes a zeal for what we make bold to say was by no means the ruling guide of his own life, and the source of his own convictions; Mr. Reade unhappily begins as though the mind were a *tabula rasa*,—all things dark, all things uncertain, with reason alone to follow up each fitful and flickering gleam until, if so be, he may be fortunate enough to reach some definite and sure ground at the last. And however crude and incorrect may be Mr. Moir's opinions as to the condition of fallen man,—however he may appear to think that the soul of man after the fall could hold communion with God even as before, and that the mind, although corrupted, of itself and immediately, was able to rise to the throne of Him who is infinite in purity as in justice;—however glimpses of such notions, (abundantly contradicted, happily, by the real faith and practice of the man) may, in a few places, be discerned;—Mr. Reade does not seem to be aware that the condition of man after the

Digitized by Google

fall is totally and essentially different to what it had been before; that the image of God was then broken and defaced; that, although doubtless there remained traces of that image yet pointing to a better condition as its origin, there could henceforth be no more immediate intercourse between the mind and soul of man and his Maker, than exists between man and the brute creation; that there was (if we may reverently say it) no common ground any longer; that Infinite Purity could have no communion with what is sinful and impure; and that hence the sentence, instantaneous and unqualified, of death passed upon man,—of death, which, apart from the dissolution of the body, and previous to it, consists in the utter and total cutting off of all intercourse between the soul and God.

Hence he fails entirely of grasping the necessity of mediation to bridge over the chasm now spread between, and loses sight of the whole work so accomplished; embracing, as an inevitable consequence, the theory, that man, apart from any mediatorial work, and in his fallen nature, is still perfectible. There is but little cause for wonder, then, that the nature and capabilities of human reason should be the theme of most absorbing interest; all the present and all the future lies at stake upon it; all the difficulties, the inextricable perplexities attendant on this mysterious subject, unaided by the light from Heaven, must be faced in a vain effort to cope with and unravel them. Surely, it must leave a painful feeling, a consciousness of grievous want, a yearning for clearer knowledge, ever clamorous and all unsatisfied, in the mind of a man who, on the retrospect of his whole life, feels—

> 'The mission is fulfill'd' his 'soul was set to do,
> To read the truth, to look the heart of man and nature through;'—
> (ii. 403.)

that, after all, so very little has been accomplished, that after years of intense anxiety and effort of thought, he is still doomed to tread the compass of no wider a circle than was permitted to the footsteps of Aristotle or of Plato. Nay, rather, it seems, that in proportion as men, living in a Christian age and country, refuse to avail themselves of the light which is given to clear up what else were unfathomable mysteries, so, in proportion, they must fall into uncertainties, and discover difficulties, from which the philosophers of the heathen world were comparatively free.

Much the greater portion of these volumes is taken up with five poems, which are cast in a dramatic form; and almost all the remaining portion with two poems entitled, the one 'Revelations of Life,' the other 'Italy.' The subject of the former connects it immediately with one of the dramatic pieces.

Digitized by Google

The latter is a poem in four parts, or cantos, containing the author's descriptions of places and things which he saw in that country, and his sentiments and reflections upon them, and which, if it contains some of the obscurest and harshest passages to be found in these volumes, presents also many examples of his highest excellences. It is not certainly ground trodden for the first time; there are few that have not perused the pleasant pages of Mr. Rogers; fewer still who are not acquainted with 'Childe Harold:' with the former the present poem has no similarity, but it is upon the whole, in its plans, only an enlargement of the fourth canto of the latter. Very many of the objects are taken in precisely the same order, and frequently also suggest the same course of thought. It is far from being our wish to accuse the writer of plagiarism, or to urge against him that he should not have attempted to treat of subjects already handled by others with consummate skill and power. Clearly there is the same freedom still to all to wander through these same scenes, and to give their judgments and thoughts concerning them to the world, if they are worth the having. Italy itself can never become hackneyed, any more than any place can, which is hallowed by countless associations and memorials of ages past, and on which the hand of God has poured forth so rich a flood of beauty; and reasonably, also, we may expect that the contemplation of the same object may suggest similar expressions to different minds according as they approach each other in power and activity. We can have no reason, therefore, to murmur that another delineation has been given to us of Florence, of Rome, of Terni, of Dante, Petrarch, Tasso, of St. Peter's, the Pantheon, the Colosseum; but the comparison instantly arises in the mind, between this poem and that of the mighty bard, who has left us more to sorrow for than to admire. Any one who writes of Santa Croce, or of those who there lie buried, of Venice and all its fallen beauty, must be conscious that he is drawing this comparison upon himself, even though he display sufficient originality of mind to exempt him from any further imputation of wearing borrowed plumes. Mr. Reade's plan brings out more fully a defect discernible in a measure in 'Childe Harold'—abruptness, namely, in passing from one object to another, more especially when these are works of art. There is the Venus de Medici, and the Laöcoon, and the Apollo Belvedere, and the Gladiator, and all with a stanza or two apportioned to them, until we fancy ourselves reading a very musical catalogue in metre. On these several works as on others, the ideas of Mr. Reade show a marked and close agreement with those of Lord Byron; with him he almost adores the Venus de Medici, and bows down before the horrors of the Laocoön. It

Digitized by Google

is needless here to diverge into a discussion on the scope and limit of Grecian art; it may be hoped that a sounder and more healthful judgment on these subjects is growing up in the public mind, from the admirable criticisms of Mr. Ruskin in his volumes of 'Modern Painters.' We are forced into comparisons, when we read of the Apollo Belvedere, that

> 'In severe supremacy alone
> He stands, ere soaring to the heavenly clime;
> A breathing deity in marble shown!
> The vision of a god incorporate in stone:'—(ii. 71.)

with the lines on the same from 'Childe Harold'—

> 'When each conception was a heavenly guest,
> A ray of immortality, and stood
> Star-like around until they gather'd to a god;'

and even more strongly in the following—the former being Mr. Reade's, the latter Lord Byron's.

> 'Space whirls around him—'tis not the crowd's roar
> He hears; the blood from his laxed arteries
> Sounds ebbing like the spent waves on the shore.
> In the red sands beneath, he sees arise
> Green fields and trees, loved forms and speaking eyes,
> And kinsmen's beckoning hands: he lifts his head,
> A flashing light, home's far realities
> Buried in thunder-clouds sink darken'd, fled,
> His quivering limbs convulse: life passes; he is dead.'—ii. 68.

> 'The arena swims around him: he is gone,
> Ere heard the inhuman shout which hail'd the wretch who won.
>
> He heard it but he heeded not; his eyes
> Were with his heart, and that was far away.
> He recked not of the life he lost, nor prize,
> But where his rude hut by the Danube lay.
> There were his young barbarians all at play,
> There was their Dacian mother; he their sire
> Butcher'd to make a Roman holiday.'

An individual thought sometimes recals another in 'Childe Harold;' the following, certainly, not superior to the one which it resembles:—

> 'Earth cleft asunder in her depths is shown
> Tongueing red fires: escaped their cavern'd thrall,
> Whirlwinds rush howling, drown'd in the deep tone
> Of the far sea, that doth the mountain call,
> The thunder's rending blast doth answer back to all.'—ii. 96.
>
> 'Far along
> From peak to peak the rattling crags among
> Leaps the live thunder: not from one lone cloud,
> But every mountain now hath found a tongue,
> And Jura answers through her misty shroud,
> Back to the joyous Alps who call to her aloud.'—*Childe Harold.*

Digitized by Google

And again—

'The Paradise of Italy, the bower
And throne of luxury; where the air breathed love
And passionate feeling, making life's brief hour
One long enjoyment.'—ii. 100.

'Clarens, sweet Clarens, birthplace of deep love,
Thine air is the young breath of passionate thought,
Thy trees take root in love,' &c.—*Childe Harold.*

Or again, of the sea—

'Thou mirrorest the Infinite on thy breast,
In thy all fathomless depths is typed the Almighty's rest.'—ii. 116.

'Thou glorious mirror where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in tempest: in all time .....
The image of eternity, the throne
Of the Invisible.'—*Childe Harold.*

We might have been disposed to think that a poet would shrink from handling one or two subjects which have produced some matchless passages of 'Childe Harold;' yet he does not hesitate to

'Pause, when like a steadfast exhalation,
O'er yon green bank Clitumnus rears his shrine:
Is that all delicate temple the creation
Of human hands? as clasps the elm the vine,
The sculptured leaves around those columns twine.'—ii. 35.

Surely there is not music here equal to the melody which sings of Clitumnus,—

'The sweetest wave
Of the most living crystal that was e'er
The haunt of river nymph;'

where

'On thy happy shore a temple still
Of small and delicate proportion keeps,
Upon a mild declivity of hill,
Its memory of thee.'—*Childe Harold.*

We have not quoted the remainder of Mr. Reade's stanza; we refrain, therefore, from adding the lines of faultless beauty which close that of Lord Byron.

There are many similar instances, as in the stanzas in the Thrasymene, the Falls of Terni, the Fountain of Egeria; but there are likewise pictures of great beauty, which at the same time are entirely original. We are led to Venice, when

'The sun is setting: his last rays are steeping
In golden hues yon clouds that steadfast keep
Their station, on the blue horizon sleeping,
Breasting the sky yet blending with the deep;
Lo! from their braided edges glittering creep
Sharp pointed spires, in blue air faintly shown,
O'er-shadow'd as the sea mists round them sweep;
Away! those shadows are to substance grown,
For Venice there doth sit upon her ocean throne.'—ii. 22.

Digitized by Google

Again we are standing under the stupendous arch that canopies the Apostle's tomb—

'The pride, the boast of Rome,
Orb'd as the world, and floating as on air,
In dazzling light expands the mighty dome,
Mirror of heaven, but heaven when she doth wear,
All galaxied with stars her flashing hair.'—45.

Once more—

'It is the morn, the ever blessed morn,'

and we gaze where

'Silent Naples slumbers; child of mirth,
She sees nor hears the beauty o'er her shed,
Sleeping as sleeps an infant at its birth;
The elements, her handmaids, softly tread,
Attending breathlessly beside her wave-lulled bed.

'For like a blue-eyed spirit, the sky above
Bends from its arching throne the earth to greet;
The air sighs over her its breath of love,
The deep-voiced sea breathes music at her feet,
The hills the echoes of her life repeat;
The hues that tint her brow by Iris given,
Caught from yon sun that steals on her retreat,
While gentler still his orbed wheel is driven,
Watching her sleep beneath the holy vault of heaven.'—85.

We must content ourselves with but one extract more from stanzas on the Colosseum. This appears the most powerful part of the poem, and will well bear any comparison with the beautiful description in Childe Harold; we do not forget at the same time the wonderful picture given of the same pile as seen by moonlight, in Manfred.

'Hark! midnight's slumberous air is musical
With the low carolling of birds, that seem
To hold here an enduring festival;
How do their notes and nature's flowers redeem
The place from old pollution: if the stream
And reek of blood gush'd forth from man and beast,
If Cain-like brethren gloated o'er the steam
Of immolation as a welcome feast,
Ages have cleansed the stain, the unnatural strife hath ceased.
* * * * * *

'Along its broken edges on a sky
Of azure, sharply, delicately traced,
The light bird flits o'er flowers that wave from high,
Where human foot shall never more be based:
Grass mantles the arena mid defaced
And broken columns, freshly, wildly spread;
And through those hollow windows, once so graced
With glittering eyes, faint stars their twinkling shed,
As if they smiled within those sockets of the dead.
* * * * * *

Digitized by Google

'Lo! there the moon sleeps, flooding that white ground,
Paling with ghastly sheen each column's height,
While the gigantic circle yawns around,
Drear, silent, savage, through which, twinkling bright,
Shine stars like eyes: and strange and solemn sight,
The illimitable space yawns blackly o'er:
Yet who would see that pile in beauty's light,
Be it not silver'd thus by moonlight o'er,
But when departing Day adds there one glory more.
For with that ruin and the dying day,
Are human sympathies man more can feel:
The red light magnifies its grand decay,
Hallowing the wounds which it would not conceal:
Tints that are harmonies then round it steal,
Hues which are Nature's feeling for the past:
Doth she not ever such with time reveal,
And on the wreck her nameless magic cast,
Religion of the place that shall grey faiths outlast?'—69.

We hear much of grey faiths elsewhere, stated in so unqualified a manner, as almost to make us suspect that the writer has some notion of the possibility of the Christian faith following the same course. But for the present we must leave such topics.

We have already noticed resemblances between 'Italy' and 'Childe Harold;' we must speak differently of those which are to be found between the two dramas of 'The Deluge' and 'Destiny,' and the dramas of 'Heaven and Earth' and 'Cain' of Lord Byron, more especially in the former. The whole plan and argument of 'The Deluge' is so completely identical with that of 'Heaven and Earth,' the characters introduced speak throughout in so similar a strain, the very order of the scenes is so entirely the same, the very opinions bear so strong a correspondence, that it is most difficult to see what possible motive the writer could have had in composing it. We are not imputing plagiarism, or denying that there are many parts of most exceeding tenderness and pathos; but we must maintain that there is nothing here which is not contained in 'Heaven and Earth,' albeit at not so great length; and, moreover, that the impression left on the mind after perusing each is, as regards the moral statements contained in them, precisely the same. There are indeed different names assigned; in each, contradicting the account of Holy Writ, one of the sons of Noah is represented as unmarried at the time of the deluge, and moreover as unsuccessful in his love: in 'Heaven and Earth' he keeps the name of Japheth, in the 'Deluge' he receives that of Irad; in both there is a friend of this son of Noah, similarly circumstanced, called by Lord Byron Irad, but here Hammon. There are two sisters, one of whom Irad (*i. e.* Japheth) wishes to gain as his wife, who have chosen as their lovers two angels; these Mr. Reade calls Astarte and Azoara, who in every single feature of

Digitized by Google

their characters correspond precisely with Lord Byron's Anah and Aholibamah; there is scarcely a solitary touch found in the one which does not exist in the other also. In both Noah is introduced at the same moment, and gives the same warning and condemnation; in the one it is Raphael who is sent to recal the angels, in the other it is the Archangel Michael. The angels, Israphil and Oraziel, stand for Samiasa and Azaziel; and at the end are introduced some characters speaking according to their several conditions of heart exactly in the same way. Were it granted that the present poem equals its predecessor in fire of language and vigour of thought, (and we are not disposed to deny it,) yet, not being able to rate it higher, we ask again whether it was designed to teach us anything more, and we look in vain to the drama itself for an answer. There are but two points in which Mr. Reade differs from Lord Byron; making in the one case the angels depart from the earthly loves, while in 'Heaven and Earth' they bear them away; the other is an instance, where, unwilling as we are to acknowledge it, the sublime appears too nearly bordering upon its opposite. The ark has already floated, and is borne in its course towards a mountain peak, whereon are the two sisters with their angel lovers; Irad seizes the opportunity to endeavour to prevail on Astarte to enter the ark, even at that last moment, and holds a long colloquy for that purpose out of the window, until at length he wishes himself to be cast out, and Noah interposes, charging his other sons to

> 'Come forth,
> Your fraternal strength essay,
> And drag this child of sin away,
> Ere he waken God to wrath.'

Lord Byron, with better taste in this respect, reconciles him to his father by the intercession of the Archangel Raphael.

The question of the meaning of the words, 'the sons of God taking to themselves wives of the daughters of men,' is touched upon in some notes accompanying the drama; according to which (although he keeps to the other account in the poem) Mr. Reade seems to incline to the idea that they were 'righteous men' of the seed of Seth, united to wicked women of the race of Cain. It is certainly a remarkable physiological fact, that the union of a good man with a bad woman should in any way produce a giant; but the whole subject is amply treated of in Dr. Maitland's Essay entitled 'Eruvin.'

The poem opens with Irad alone in the desert of Mount Hermon, where he is joined by Astarte, with whom he pleads his love in vain; his parting words are touching:—

Digitized by Google

'Fare thee well,—yet wherefore
Say I that word to thee still ever near me?
When thy light footsteps are no longer heard,
The falling leaf is as that well-known sound;
When I depart, I see thee still, thy presence
Light-like is round me; when I hear thee not,
I can create thy voice, while memory
Lives on its echoes: when I turn from thee
I leave thee not, thine image fills my being,
My body's soul that else were tenantless.'—P. 113.

Irad departs, and Azoara entering, the sisters converse as in the opening of 'Heaven and Earth.' Astarte is scrupulous; Azoara chides her—

'Live,
As Lillah lives with Hammon: toil and spin;
Tend children, flocks and herds; shut up thy soul
From all communion with the life beyond.'—P. 114.

Even as, for like reason, Aholibamah tells Anah—

'Wed thee
Unto some son of clay, and toil and spin;
There's Japheth loves thee well, hath loved thee long:
Marry and bring forth dust.'

And as Astarte, speaking of her angel lover, says—

'I feel our ties unhallow'd,
Our meetings are perturb'd, unlike the calm
That comes with Irad; consciousness withal
Of erring felt;'—(p. 115.)

so Anah, with less harshness of expression, says—

'I love our God less since his angel loved me:
This cannot be of good.'

Astarte

'Sighs, remembering her mortality—
Feeling when he must mourn the child of dust,
Turning to heaven forgetting her for ever;'—(p. 118.)

Anah, more true we think to womanly love, says—

'I pity him,
His grief will be of ages, or at least
Mine would be such for him, were I the seraph
And he the perishable.'

Azoara is more lofty—

'We are immortal and we feel it; we
May die, but cannot perish: to forget
Is impotence unknown to heavenly nature.'—P. 118.

As, similarly, Aholibamah—

'Feels' her 'immortality o'ersweep
All pains, all tears, all time, all fears.'

Digitized by Google

The angels draw nigh, and Azoara greets them—

'See
The watcher's light is trembling o'er the peak
Of Hermon; and the angels even now
Unfold their heavenly wings. Lo, where a trail
Of light parts from yon orb in floating mist,
The glory left behind them in their flight.'—P. 119.

Even as they are greeted in 'Heaven and Earth,'—

'Lo, they have kindled all the west,
Like a returning sunset: lo,
On Ararat's late secret crest
A mild and many-colour'd bow,
The remnant of their flashing path,
Now shines.'

The colloquies of Irad with Hammon and Noah are of the same purport with those of Japheth with Irad and Noah; but we cannot afford to make extracts. In a like way Irad confronts the angels, and questions them of their power to save the sisters from the doom impending, and is repelled here by being told that his apprehensions are

'Visions of phantasy, engenderings
Of watching and of fast;'—(p. 143,)

as in 'Heaven and Earth,' that he is an 'enthusiast,' who

'Dreams
The worst of dreams, the phantasies engender'd
By hopeless love and heated vigils.'

The deluge approaches; Noah comes to take away his son from the company of the sinful, and a scene follows corresponding to a like part in 'Heaven and Earth.' Resemblances abound, but one or two must suffice:—

'Hence, if ye would be safe,—
Even now their caves the waters chafe,
Their chains are loosen'd; they shall forth and sweep
O'er mountain heights, till earth become the deep;
Spirits, away, your home is in the sky;
But earth must perish in her watery grave,
And these must suffer—
Israphil.—Nothing; we will soar
With them to an enduring star,
A realm of peace and love afar,
To dwell with us in bliss for evermore.
Noah.—Be yours to prove the strength within ye left,
Of your obedience, faith, and truth bereft.'—P. 150.

With these contrast the following from 'Heaven and Earth:'—

'Hark! Hark! Already can we hear the voice
Of glowing Ocean's gloomy swell;
The winds, too, plume their piercing wings,
The clouds have nearly fill'd their springs,' &c.

Digitized by Google

'Yet, yet, oh fly:
Ye cannot die,
But they
Shall pass away,
While ye shall fill with shrieks the upper sky
For perishable clay.'

'We will bear ye far
To some untroubled star,
Where thou and Anah shall partake our lot.'

'The moment cometh to approve thy strength:
And learn at length
How vain to war with what thy God commands.
Thy former force was in thy faith.'

The flood is nearer still. Irad soliloquises in strains similar to those of Japheth; the sisters and the angels begin to feel the coming judgment; the Archangel summons Israphil and Oraziel away,—they refuse: the waters rise; death and ruin are gulfing all on every side; the passions of men are let loose,—some frantic, some blaspheming, one acknowledging the justice of God, in terms more fully drawn out, indeed, but in meanings precisely similar to those of the closing portion of 'Heaven and Earth.' The whole is very powerful and very painful; pathos can scarcely exceed that of the following, which we are compelled to extract, albeit at some length, on account of its exceeding beauty. Astarte is taking her last look at the home and haunts of her childhood:—

'Farewell,
Beautiful Earth, where I no more must dwell:
Farewell the dim and leafy places, where
These eyes first open'd on the azure air,
And drank in all the glories of the day,
Stamp'd in my heart that cannot pass away,
The voiceful love and life in it that dwells,
The gladness of the gracious Earth which swells
Upward, while welcoming the light it loved,
Hues shed from God upon his work approved.
The stars outlooking when the sun had set,
As if they fear'd their eyes I should forget,
Making me feel while yearning to each shrine,
Although they spake not, that their homes were mine!
Farewell, the holiest twilight! beauty spread
Over her bosom that reflection told
Of Eden beneath that ethereal fold
Hidden, of roses in their fragrance shed.
Farewell, my once loved flowers! companions given,
Blending their life with mine, that I have felt
Were living things, that sympathies in them dwelt
With mine, remembrances from parted Heaven,
For in bright sunshine I have seen them glad,
As if my joy they had;
Drooping their heads, beneath the sky o'ercast,
With a felt sorrow: they too die, like me,

Digitized by Google

> But not alone; when their brief being is pass'd
> They leave behind them for their memory
> Their odorous breathings and their fading leaves,
> Frail playthings of the wind, the wind that grieves,
> Or seems to grieve above them.'—P. 158.

Who could read this without feeling its beauty? and yet to what purpose are our sympathies to be thus awakened, and our feelings pained, at the thought that so much of sweetness, and gentleness, and beauty, and goodness, was to be swallowed up in the common destruction? It would be hard to accuse Mr. Reade of a motive which we fear lurks in 'Heaven and Earth,' —a desire to paint the daughters of men in a favourable light, so as to leave the impression that the deluge was an act of injustice; yet, surely, taking the present as a fair picture of that awful time, it is difficult to avoid feeling a proneness to entertain some such opinion, however modified; but rather, may it not be said that this representation, and that in 'Heaven and Earth,' are both mistaken? 'They were eating and drinking, 'marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe en-'tered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and 'took them all away?'

And are *we* to suppose that any still entertained feelings pure and gentle, love of God, repentance for past sinfulness; or be led to believe that there were many such, and not one or two only? He, whose mercy had spared the guilty cities of the plain had there been but ten righteous found therein, has not for nothing told us that all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. Are we to think that any stretched out their hands towards the ark as it floated forth upon the waters and cried to be taken in? Was not an utter, total, dead unconsciousness the very characteristic of that death-doomed race? The object of the scorn of a hundred years now no longer stood upon the dry land, and yet we can scarcely imagine but that it remained as a mark for the scoffer still. The sea was indeed raging, and the floods of heaven descending, but we know how the heart can lull itself to rest by thinking of coincidences; and so probably they spoke peace to themselves by saying that it was but a great rain, and the mountains would yield them succour: the ark must surely have been now a great way off, where no mortal voice could reach, before the delusion gave place to the frightful reality, and the bitterness of death fell on them.

The drama of 'Destiny' has much the same scope and plan with Lord Byron's 'Cain.' It is not, indeed, so daring on the whole; but there is not much apparent difference between the

Digitized by Google

philosophy of either; nor does it seem to throw much further light on the mysterious consequences of the fall, or put before us in new colours the condition of the mind of Cain. The death of Abel precedes the opening of the poem; Cain has set his face to go to the land of Nod; but otherwise the scenes are much in the same order as in the drama of Lord Byron, although the plan is more elaborated. There are likewise many resemblances of thought, and even of expression. Lucifer appears to Cain, and learns how far he is prepared to oppose an indomitable will to all that may fall to his lot; and bears him into the abyss of the earth, and then into the void of space, showing him the ghosts or phantoms of worlds already wrecked, of beings existing on this earth's surface before man's creation, and also the history of things to come. After which follows a scene which is almost the only portion of the drama which does not in some measure resemble 'Cain:' this is 'the Paradise of Heilel,' the abode of a being, as she is described, of all sweetness, and gentleness, and love, but in whose heart there is a void, yearning for the love of some one with whom she might share her whole thoughts. Cain is brought before her, and she instantly hails him as the realization of all her longings, and for awhile they dwell in harmony, but presently the darkness and obstinacy of Cain reveals itself, and the love of Heilel, not meeting with entire communion of thought on his part, receives a fatal wound; thus showing, it may be concluded, that even a paradise will be no paradise to him who is given over to the moody waywardness of a fretful and ungoverned mind. Cain is then borne back to earth. Ada has already died; and after he has visited her grave, he receives a mortal wound from the arrow of his son Enoch, whom he had unwittingly startled. This fact itself seems a contradiction to the implied meaning at least of Holy Writ; as also does the mention of a child of Abel. (P. 12.) But, apart from isolated facts such as these, the whole tenor of this drama, as of 'The Deluge,' seems at variance with the mind of these the earliest of the human race, and anticipates a condition of intellect and thought not realized until long afterwards. We can scarcely imagine that the condition of the world, and of man, was sifted by Cain with that subtle analysis which we find in these pages; or that the one prevailing absorbing desire was for more knowledge, intellectual, moral, physical,—a yearning to pry into things invisible as well as visible. Undoubtedly, in Cain there was no submission, no obedience; much of moodiness and jealousy, with an inflexible and indomitable obstinacy; but it seems in the strictest analogy to be probable that the characters of those early times were simple and easily analyzed, whether for good or for evil: it

Digitized by Google

seems very difficult to predicate of them those complex and intricate conditions of mind which the growth of knowledge, the multiplication of the human race, and with it of new wants, new emergencies, new appliances, were likely to create; we can scarcely suppose Cain to have said that—

> 'It is
> The consciousness of limited power, of want,
> Which is itself an impotence; facultied
> To see injustice we may not reprove,
> To know oppression, yet endure, feeling
> The ashes in our hearts: yet the large pride
> Of knowing, consciousness of the infinite
> Tendency mounting in us, stooping not
> To the yoke brute-like driven, resisting nature,
> Give joy that mocks the evil it bewails.'—P. 10.

Nor is it very easy to see what oppression or injustice Cain could have beheld, which yet he could not reprove, or upon whom they could have been practised. The fratricide which he had himself committed might surely have stopped his mouth, at least on such themes as these. The conversations of Cain with Lucifer are far more abstruse and learned than those in Lord Byron's drama; and *they* are sufficiently so. There is but slender probability that his temptations took so minute and subtle a form, addressed solely to the intellect, apart from all grosser passions: and many of the arguments of the Evil One seem little calculated to further his proposed ends. But, undoubtedly, there is a proneness in many writers, when wishing to describe the force of temptation on others, to put it in that form in which it would most press upon themselves; and Mr. Reade would doubtless have the keenest appreciation of the strength which the intellectual forms of it possess. It is from this cause, we conclude, that another poem, termed the 'Drama of Life,' which gives an example of a life of early promise overclouded, is cast in the peculiar form which it bears. With the exception of a few pages, the whole is a series of conversations between Count Malefort, the victim of ill-regulated passions and a misgoverned mind, who reasons very abstrusely, and a certain Stranger, whom, at first sight, he pronounces 'a noticeable man, in whom thought dwells;' and certainly the sequel fully proves it. With what precise purpose it was written we cannot say, not having been able to peruse it without a certain unpleasant confusion of mind, arising from characters contradicting each other amidst a medley of the most conflicting opinions every fifth or sixth page. The dramatic is, in some respects, a convenient form of writing. If a charge be brought against one side or the other, it is an easy thing to say, that it is no opinion of the author, but belongs solely to the fictitious

Digitized by Google

character by whom the words are supposed to be uttered. At the same time, if, in such pieces, wicked men only are introduced, it should be in such sort that the reader shall clearly see the wickedness throughout, and perceive, moreover, the writer's judgment regarding it. We can perceive no more here than that Malefort is represented as the victim of his own inveterate habits of mind, which bring misery to those whom he ought most to love, but against which he does not struggle, as being unconquerable, and vainly murmuring because he fails of reaching the heights of a long-cherished ambition, while the Stranger recommends the practice of philanthropy and the 'erasing of the taint of self-love;' but this amidst such a mass of conflicting opinions and directions, that (although we have no predilections for such subjects) we feel it our duty to give the mere statements made on both sides, to show of what ill-assorted materials an ethical poem may be composed.

'Scepticism'—so it is put in the mouth of Malefort—

> 'Is on our own weak natures grafted
> Toward God as man;' (294)

and—

> 'The sense of failure
> Makes the will impotent: we feed life's lamp
> From habit hopelessly.'— 289.

Habitual reserve and coldness wearies out the affection of his wife; she dies in broken-hearted sorrow. The memory of past life possibly at the last suggesting that he was unworthy to lie by Lillian, he adds—

> 'If we be separate everlastingly,
> So be our dust.'— 343.

The guilt of some sin is heavy upon his soul, some act of violence, if not of murder, in 'wild passion' (298) and 'with wild hand' (329) committed; yet repentance is no long task; he has made no effort to conquer long fixed habits; still he draws the chief argument for the immortality of his soul from—

> 'Knowledge and repentance of its guilt;' (341)

and he beholds at last the form of his wife—

> 'Forgiveness in her eyes,
> Recorded pardon from atonement won.'—346.

But he finds comfort also elsewhere:—

> 'I talk to air,
> Yet we feel heard, or wherefore turn to Nature?
> I drew from thee peace, if not hope; none look
> On thee and feel despair: a calm is stamp'd
> Upon thy brow, that looks tranquillity;' (330.)

Digitized by Google

while yet he—

> 'Held it was no vision that on earth
> Divinity descended into man,
> Sharing our frailties and sorrows, moved
> By love ineffable, allying thus
> Our mortal dust with immortality;
> Who wrestled with our passion in himself
> To judge us mercifully, proved the weakness
> Of human nature in his own.'—P. 317.

He feels, moreover, that—

> 'There is philosophy which rises o'er
> Ambition, fortune, power, o'erwrought emotion,
> The Stoic's, turning human hearts to stone:
> There is a healthier, which submits to life
> And human feelings, that, with trustful love,
> And hope, and faith, doth enter men's abodes
> And gathers lisping children round her knees,
> And owns a sympathy with grief and joy.'—333.

But his own life has passed far otherwise:—

> 'My mind
> Hath strain'd to things indefinite, till faith
> And feeling became chill'd in phantasies
> Of earthly immortality, the breath
> Of perishable man; and now this hope,
> Frail as it was, hath left me.'—319.

For these undisciplined affections and vitiated condition of mind the Stranger propounds his antidotes. Against the host of human passions he opposes 'a self-forged shield—pride;' the desire of earthly fame he 'spurns' as the 'weakest of infirmities.'—(P. 301.) Man's praise is nothing worth, for—

> 'Behold the law of nature,
> Self-interest, the sole lever of the world.'—302.

Human nature can sink no lower:—

> 'Dust to dust returns,
> The old curse thunder'd from the knowledge tree
> On those driven to it by necessity.'—322.

But, in spite of this necessity, the soul can feel remorse and suffer pain; and this constitutes purgatory, where the soul is—

> 'Self-judge and self-tormentor, all its past
> Mortality and sins are palpable' (326);

for still after death exists—

> 'The self-accusing soul,
> Dealing on self its retribution.'—327.

Yet, elsewhere, he says of the death of Malefort's wife, that—

> 'She hath join'd the beauty around;'

and that—

> 'Her spirit lives in them
> The life of memory.'

Digitized by Google

Again and again the world of men is held up to bitter scorn, for—

> 'Each man conceals behind material veils
> Thoughts or intents abhorrèd, if reveal'd;
> In every breast dwells selfishness, rooting
> All motive, blossoming in good or ill.'—333.

Remorse, therefore, is but a relative term, because

> 'Man's estimation of deeds colours them.
> Where the sun scorches, passion is a virtue,—
> Where cold contracts, a vice'—(334);

and rightly then may he,—

> 'Scorn this imperfect thing,
> This medley of contradictions, man: sensual all,
> And hypocrites, save to the All-seeing one.'—343.

Yet remorse is what all ought to feel.

> 'Nor should'st thou pass
> Death's gate, till thou hast cleansed thy heart of guilt,
> Of thoughts or deeds oppressing thee.'—540.

His own faith he terms a noble one,—

> 'Thou makest God a tyrant, bowing to
> Thy image set up, or with doubt or fear;
> Thou typest Him, thyself a thing of passion:
> I, as the sun, His emblem set in heaven,
> All light, love, glory, and beneficence.'—342.

But withal, to a previous question from Malefort,

> 'What hast thou faith in?'

he replies,—

> 'Nothing: I demanded
> An infinite of time to know myself;
> A moment is accorded, I am silent.'—304.

And again, when he asks, pointing to the body of his wife,—

> 'Darest thou deny that an immortal essence
> Dwelt in that mortal temple?'

his answer is,—

> 'I believe,
> Hope, gainsay nothing; if it dwelt therein,
> Or whence it came, or whether fled to heaven
> Or air; it lies beyond me: I grope through
> Life's labyrinth of mysteries as then,
> The veil of central Isis still unraised.'—322.

These various views (whatever else they may be) are not very consistent; and the clearness is not heightened, when the stranger calls himself Malefort's 'visible conscience,' a phrase which by itself might have been clear, but he is also present with Malefort in his dreams, becoming here rather a quality than an embodiment of flesh and blood. This mixture of the allegorical is perplexing in the description of a character

Digitized by Google

which preserves a distinct existence even after Malefort's death. And this is the sum of the teaching derivable from the 'Dream of Life.'

The 'Revelations of Life' are a field which time forbids our traversing at length,—a poem much in the style and plan of Wordsworth's 'Excursion;' it is quite as abstruse and metaphysical (to say the least) as any of this writer's poems; containing, indeed, many happy descriptions, and some pleasing thoughts, but betraying the same defective system, gleaned altogether, as it would seem, from his own unaided reason,—unaided, because he has not chosen to avail himself of the guidance furnished in the Church of Christ, or to read the page of human life by the light of Holy Writ. But we have arrived at that portion of our task on which we most hesitate to enter,—the examination of the writer's own belief as displayed throughout these volumes. In the Dramatic poems we have no right, perhaps, to fasten one sentiment more than another on the author himself: but we approach now, although reluctantly, the unequivocal expressions of his own mind,—reluctantly, because it can be no pleasing office to convict another of defective belief and erroneous teaching, the more so, if there are qualities displayed of heart and mind which may serve in a degree to arrest the judgment. But the task forces itself upon us, and we may not shrink from it.

> 'From an impulsive age we graduate
> To a serener being, we ascend
> Pure atmosphere of thought, that shall reveal
> Infinite faculty folded up in man;'—ii. 274;

are thoughts on the present as contrasted with the prospective condition of mankind, on which, when occurring in the dramatic pieces, for reasons already given, we do not wish to lay much stress; but they are here put into the mouth of the pastor, in the 'Revelations of Life,' whose teaching is to controvert the erroneous systems of the fanatic, the enthusiast, and the fatalist; and who also further reasons that the

> 'Child of self-knowledge, "Humility,"
> Is born to mourn the passions desecrate,
> Once glorified: upon her reverent heart
> Truth shall be pedestall'd, and open peace
> Embrace the world, until the golden age
> Be vision realized.'—ii. 274.

Were there any well-weighed distinction here or elsewhere drawn between the nature of man as fallen from his first state and as recreated by the Mediator, the words might bear a true meaning; except that there is no sanction whatsoever for the indulgence of any expectation of golden ages coming in the

Digitized by Google

last time, when faith shall scarcely be found, many falling away, and the love of many others waxing cold. But this dream of human perfectibility has its birth in the idea that no real essential change came over the soul of man at the fall; hence the whole cycle of truths ranging round the one truth of the Incarnation, is either most feebly and partially grasped or wholly ignored: and this false theory as to the present natural condition of man becomes the key-note to the whole philosophy. Hence follows no higher appreciation of the mediatorial office than such a collocation as the following:—

> 'So felt the wisest of the antique world,
> . . . . Solon thus,
> And he whose name was wisdom's, Socrates.
> And thou with reverence named, who call'dst thyself
> The Son of Man, on thy redeeming mission,
> Didst teach us active duties, peace, and love,
> Bade wisdom learn the knowledge of herself,
> To sit at home with children round her knees.'—ii. 309.

Most partial and inadequate as this is, we may not shrink from saying how entirely uncertain and erroneous the whole teaching becomes when taken together with the following words spoken by Noah, the prophet of God:—

> 'God walks no more with man alone
> In Eden, yet doth watch his own.
> Yea, one shall emanate from Him,
> Transmuted Godhead, who shall make
> Archangel's glories on his right hand dim.
> He shall teach man his spirit's heavenly lot,
> By sin, and doubt, and pride forgot,
> Till he shall earthly creeds forsake
> For truth.'—Vol. i. p. 149.

Man, then, has but forgotten his real condition: it is only needed that his memory should be roused by teaching, to bring him back to all his forfeited happiness and virtue. Every fact and every doctrine of the Mediation, of our reunion with God through the incarnation of His Son, of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the recreated members of Christ's body—everything, in short, which makes the faith of Christ to be in any wise different from or better than the systems of any earthly philosopher, are by one sweeping blow thrown down and thrust aside. The rock, steadfast and sure, is abandoned; and the house which must now be raised can be built only on the shifting sand, rocking before each driving wind. We must look to meet with inconsistencies, and contradictions, and vagueness of view, and we shall not fail of finding them. Whether the mind relies solely on itself, or the soul places her trust on all which God has given to guide her, the one want must still

Digitized by Google

remain, the yearning to be united to Him from whom it had its being, to overpass the barriers which now are felt to intervene. Human wisdom has striven to solve the problem, and must still strive, whensoever the Divine light vouchsafed does not fall upon it;—new systems, or old ones revived, must still be resorted to when, starting from the assertion, that the 'true 'creed of happiness is contained in the one book, and is evolved 'from the lives of the wisest, that is, the best of mankind,' (ii. 265,) a man once accustoms himself thus to address God,—

> 'Make thou progressive man
> Image of thy majestic universe,
> Harmonious and august. Let him endure
> Beyond the grave, not from his human worth,
> Which is as nought, whose name is frailty,
> But through the ineffable Atonement won,
> In bodiless essence, or in spiritual form,
> Even as thou wilt,'—

a mode of speaking permissible, were it not declared already how the soul exists after the life on earth is ended. Once resort absolutely to visible things as a guide of faith, thankful for lessons,

> 'Learnt not from pedant schools, but thee,
> Almighty nature; thou hast held to me
> The mirror of myself and of the One
> My nothingness revealing silently;
> Thou hast the calm instill'd, the knowledge won,
> That feels progressing life is in each day begun'—(ii. 114;)

and language will immediately follow, which grates as irreverent upon the ears of those who do not dare to think so unrestrainedly,—such expressions as the following, addressed to Death:—

> 'Or art thou life, or art thou time,
> Or, godlike, art thou three in one,
> Thou dread of every age and clime?'—i. 359.

Or again, as

> 'Man crown'd by triad art.'

Or, speaking of a statue, as a

> 'Glorious and living incarnation.'—ii. 70.

This freedom from restraint in thought and language once attained, the way is easier for the raising up a system of belief, or rather a series of suppositions, to solve the dark riddle of human life. How is the soul to be assured of an existence after death, and what shall that condition be? These are the two great questions: of the former, the soul is its own evidence,—

Digitized by Google

'I stood the worms and dead among,
And yet I felt a living soul
Within me, scorning the control
Of Fate it must obey.'—i. 351.

'I feel in me the spark divine
Of life was lighted, Lord, from thine.'—i. 354.

'I,
Within this body's cell immured,
Look'd out into infinity,
Till, gazing on its face, I felt
The Infinite within me dwelt.'—i. 357.

The other is answered on more equivocal authority,—

'Ambition beckon'd to the sky,
And told me I was great;
That there shone immortality,
A purer, loftier state;
That I should flee from star to star
In infinite progression, join'd
With things that everlasting are
By God enshrined,'—(i. 352,)

from star to star—

'Where onward they innumerable roll
Through space, the thunder music of the spheres.
Each atom portion of the living soul
Of the vast heart that vibrates through the whole'—(ii. 110);

being then, as now,

'A part of the eternal soul that glows
In all things which through life, death, motion dwells,
Whose pulse each blade of grass each world revolving tells.'—ii. 111.

Much as this would seem to deny individual responsibility, there are other passages which assert it; but on this point, as on the subject of repentance, there are strange contradictions. Sometimes he speaks of pardon obtained upon repentance, at others he avows neither repentance nor regret on the retrospect of past life. We can but give them as they occur in two poems of great beauty and tenderness, very recently written in the scene of his boyhood, where

'Mendip's bleak and barren heights again enclosed me round,
Like faces of forgotten friends met on forgotten ground.'

And touching indeed is the picture drawn of old recollections:—

'The lark sprang from the turf again, and cleaved the air along,
Intoxicate with joy, he pour'd forth madly in his song:
The clouds on the blue sky reposed, and silently reveal'd
Their waiting aspect, and the calm on each vast forehead seal'd.

'The thistle's beard flew past me, but, as once, I chased it not:
I stood where games were play'd whose very names I had forgot.
I saw the faces I had raised, I met each answering eye,
I heard their eager voices fill the halls of memory.

Digitized by Google

'I clasp'd their hands again, and join'd the exulting game, and chased
With them the bounding football, and the covert pathway traced,
Where, when the holidays drew nigh, I loved alone to roam,
To picture forth my sister's clinging welcome to my home.

'The thistle waving by me broke that dream of shadows: I
Alone stood on the heath before the wind and open sky:
The past receded from me like the clouds upon the scene,
I stood within the present, yearning back to what had been.

'Where are they now, those forms and faces, shadows still endear'd,
Those ardent hearts that swell'd around, that hated,—hoped, and fear'd?
Or dead, or living, scatter'd o'er the earth, so changèd, they
Are creatures of another world, whose mould hath pass'd away.

* * * * * *

'Even now I rise and pace the desert heath with firmer tread:
I cast depression to the winds: I raise to heaven my head.
I feel the mission is fulfill'd my soul was set to do,
To read the truth, to look the heart of man and nature through.

'A calmer feeling follows, and repose and grateful love,
To the spirit moving in me, and around me, and above;
That fills my veins with gladness with the silent joy I see,
In bearded faces of the clouds, in leaf, and flower, and tree;

'That tells me I am one with the divinity reveal'd,
The visible thought of God on nature's awful forehead seal'd,
The veneration and the faith, the gushing love in me,
The triad-elements, that, ray-like, fountain forth from Thee.'—ii. 403.

Beautiful words, for which we had been most thankful, if they came from one to whom a fuller and more perfect way had not been laid open. Well may the heart be sad and the mind perplexed as it looks at once upon the future and the past; and this painful uncertainty appears in the following lines, addressed to the same scene of his boyhood:—

'I left thee, with the million proved the force
Of human passion, love, faith, hate, remorse,
All this worn bosom wasted in their course.

'And yet I live a monument in whom
They buried lie: my bosom is their tomb,
Where memory sheds a sanctifying gloom.

'Nor there repentance watcheth, nor regret:
I nought would change, all I avoided, met,
Meshes of one inextricable net.

'I felt the chains I struggled with, and failed:
Evil that fell upon me was entail'd
By fate or nature, conquer'd when assail'd.

* * * * *

'Ineffable, Eternal, and unknown
Wisdom! the visible universe thy throne,
Whose mystery most is in our being shown,

'Hear me! here kneeling, where my boyhood grew,
Again in me life's earliest faiths renew,
The trust, the love, I from thy spirit drew.

Digitized by Google

'Life is oblivion, hope its sigh suppress'd:
Let the great mystery in darkness rest,
So, childlike, I be gather'd to thy breast,

'Or in Thyself, or in the universe,
Thy visible thought: and be this final verse
Record of him whose spirit Thou didst nurse.'—ii. 407.

And is it so, then, that any, whether in the springtime of life, or when earthly toil is drawing to a close, can content himself with the thought that life is a great mystery; and leave it to rest in darkness, not knowing whether his soul will preserve a distinct and conscious existence, or be absorbed into the general life that pervades the universe? Life is indeed mysterious, but the veil has in part been raised, and they who will, may walk by the light shining in the dark places. The mists still loom before that world unseen, but they are broken; and they whose feet are stayed upon the Rock, may enter into the cloud, with fear, indeed, but with hope and comfort still. Most inscrutable it is that the highest vigour of intellect and so great beauty of mind and disposition, should be permitted thus to wander 'in the wilderness out of the way:' most wonderful that oftentimes they whose powers, mental and moral, appear most calculated to do great things for the cause of God, are yet found warring against Him: it is not so, happily, in this case; but it is the spirit crying out to be led forth into the paths of truth, and yet refusing to be guided in the ways that are ordained. The desire may be for truth,—the heart may long to serve God and to attain to the knowledge of Him,—yet while wandering in a course self-chosen, we may fear that the words apply to us, 'He that gathereth not with me, scattereth.'

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—1. *The Law relating to Convocations of the Clergy, with Forms of Proceeding in the Provinces of Canterbury and York. By* ROBERT R. PEARCE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. London: S. Sweet. 1848.

2. *Morning Chronicle*, from July 28 to August 25, 1852.

3. *The Guardian*, of the same period.

4. *John Bull*, of the same period.

OBSERVERS of nature are often struck with a certain graceful and easy power which some animals possess, either of reviving from a prolonged state of dormant existence, or of changing their whole scene of action, and at once assuming instinctive habits that have long been interrupted, apparently unconscious of any cessation having taken place. How different in nature is the process of first construction from that of revived energies! Long and painful days of helpless deformity, or at least a very gradual development of powers, are incident to animal life in different stages of its growth, before the living being is thoroughly itself: but once let it have matured its nature, and every act of conscious identity for the future will at once be the immediate and unlaboured result of its instinctive faculties, whatever length of time may separate one from the other. It is weeks before the youthful swallow learns the strength and knowledge to float for insect food by certain accustomed streams, and rest in certain nooks; but let it once have known its home and its living pastures, and long months of winter may altogether estrange it from our observation; yet when the time is come, we shall see it so quietly and naturally following its old avocations, that some moments will intervene before we are conscious ourselves that it is a comparative stranger. Descending even to reptiles, for a like principle, we hear of toads immured for indefinite spaces of time within a narrowness of compass that has forbidden all motion whatever, which nevertheless, when once released, are observed immediately to perform locomotion, according to the nature of its species. The seven sleepers are recorded to have passed through a centenarian slumber, without at all deadening the acuteness of their perceptions when at length aroused into life.

The moral we may learn from this analogy of nature, and from this dream of the human fancy, is surely this; that, without any general application of the rule, there may yet be cases of suspended life, or the suspension of some particular function, the subjects of which, on a fitting occasion, are seen before our eyes, all at once, in real vigour of existence. But it is not our purpose to

Digitized by Google

adduce analogies in order to prove, or even to discuss the reviving power that may exist in dormant life; we have no occasion, in the matter now under our notice, to argue in this way, that there may be life in something now apparently dead; but we have mentioned the quietness and ease of nature's reviving powers, only by way of illustration of what is already established as a fact in the parallel we would institute.

It seems but a short space, nay, but yesterday, since to talk of Convocation was the mark of archæological abstraction from all existing scenes, or of imprudent enthusiasm void of all practical wisdom and discretion. Convocation was seen to be dead, existing only in form, but without life; and the form was therefore despised, as a cast-off garment which only chance had kept from being thrown altogether away. It is true that some things do linger on in a strange way, which yet are destined only to perish; but there is a sort of presumption, that legal forms continually acted up to, and that at considerable trouble, without the smallest present advantage or apparent object, have some intrinsic meaning in them which one day will come out. And this is truly the case with Convocation. It went on, in form, through years of total obscurity to public interest, and now it is seen that the opportunity has arrived for it to awaken out of its sleep. Convocation is now a real, active power. Strange as it may seem, contrary as it may be to our wise prognostications, in direct opposition as it may be to all our notions of probability, or even possibility, we yet wake up from this oppression of the difficulties of the case, simply to behold Convocation quietly beginning to assume a natural place in our Constitution. All our fears and doubts as to its practicability were on the supposition that the whole structure had to be built up and established for the first time; whereas the machine had not to be invented, experimented on, put together by degrees, and modestly suggested to the public, in opposition to all manner of prejudices and private interests, which assail any new device, whether a new reaping-machine or an ecclesiastical canon; but it only required putting into motion, for the conquest of all preliminary difficulties, is a legacy which we derive from past times. In whatever way, therefore, differently-disposed people may hitherto have thought and talked of Convocation, one fact is now patent and declared to the world; viz. that it really is a part of the external system in which we, of this land, now live. Some may have ignored its existence, in contempt or unconsciousness; others may have thought of it only as an antiquarian subject of research; others may hear the sound of the word with a dread of being bored to death by stupid discussions; others may have formed uncomfortable alarms as to the prospect which it afforded of giving too great power of

Digitized by Google

expression to the parochial clergy, to the disparagement of dignatorial ease; while some have had a deep-set animosity to any scheme which threatened to give life and action to the Church; which animosity has periodically been quickened into a very lively degree of hatred by the thorn in the side, which the forms of synodical action have always been, when there has been any alarm of their revival. But to all these different states of knowledge or care about the subject, we feel able now to announce that Convocation is no longer a bare and deadened stem, but that the vegetation of its spring is quietly coming out, under the warming sun of a Providence which knows our necessities before we ask, and is wont to grant unto us more than either we desire or deserve. The answer, truly, seems to have been given before the question was put. It had never been seriously canvassed, as a general subject, whether the difficulties of the Church should be met by Convocation; on the contrary, all manner of schemes have been mooted to meet particular wants, which, as far as they went, and were acquiesced in by Churchmen, were a substitute for the larger plan of Convocation. But although the consent of public opinion has not been obtained, though 'The Times' has not premonished the world of the looming of this ecclesiastical nightmare on the very open system of theology ascribed by that journal to the Protestant Establishment of this country, yet nevertheless, at her Majesty's most loving desire—if we are to credit her legal writs—and 'by reason of certain difficult and 'urgent affairs concerning Us, the security and defence of the 'Church of England, and the peace and tranquillity, public good 'and defence of our kingdom and our subjects of the same,' a very large body of Clergy are summoned to appear at a certain place, concurrently with the opening of Parliament, in order 'to treat of, agree to, and conclude upon the premises and 'other things which to them shall then be more clearly explained 'on our behalf.' This Body of Clergy are now summoned to appear in Convocation, and the living or the dead state of that assembly, depends on whether the Clergy really meet, or whether, instead of converging to that ecclesiastical focus at the given time, they remain isolated in their studies or their drawing-rooms.

Of the probability of Proctors attending to their duties, we shall be able to judge by direct reference to the spirit in which their recent election has been conducted; and to this subject we invite the attention of our readers. The mere fact, however, that a large number of Proctors are returned who will certainly meet on the appointed day, is not, in its direct inference, the only ground on which we state so boldly that Convocation will assemble. That fact shows either that those who do attend, as

Digitized by Google

being favourable to its active functions, will, in the absence of such as hold other views, constitute a majority that must constitutionally be listened to; or it implies that the opponents of Convocation must actually be present in numbers sufficient to outweigh the supporters of it. In this case there will, necessarily, be a large body of the Clergy met for actual debate, if only on the question of petitioning the Crown; and with this momentum we think the ultimate success of the cause to be safe. A contest, a hard-fought battle, whether lost or won, gives reality to any movement, which in the case of Convocation is felt to be the point most required, and of far more importance than the particular result of any one division. The opponents of Convocation will be in a manner defeated on every issue, both if they stay away and if they present themselves. Meanwhile, however, we leave it to them to choose their own tactics and count their own men, and ourselves proceed to the task of reviewing the almost unanimous expression of the whole parochial clergy, as shown in the recent election of Proctors, in favour of the active functions of Convocation.[1]

The election of Proctors for Convocation has attracted so little interest now for many generations, that few persons are at all acquainted with the legal forms by which it is done. Yet these forms are of great importance as evidence of the law; they explain the presumed value of Convocation as part of our Constitution, and they impress upon the Clergy their individual responsibility in the duty of electing fit men to represent them in the arduous tasks which pertain to an ecclesiastical synod. Many clergymen have been powerfully struck, at the recent elections, with words, read in an official manner by the registrar, of which they had never been conscious as forming part of our country's law. Grievances had been felt by quiet and uncomplaining churchmen; inconsistencies of a painful kind, with reference to the Church and State question, had been impressed upon their minds as the result of parochial experience;—they had known that a remedy was wanted for evils, which long had been forced on their notice, and, without expressing their feelings in hacknied or vulgar language, they had still felt, that the Church wanted a certain liberty, which active and living institutions must have if they are to be of real use;—they had witnessed the trial or attempted trial of many schemes for the government and regulation of Church affairs;—they had in turn

[1] So important and practical has the subject already become, that we have received the announcement of a Monthly Journal 'in which the progress of the present movement will be detailed, and all information on the subject collected.' The proposed periodical, of which the first number is to appear in November, will be styled 'Synodalia.' (Whitaker, Pall Mall.)

Digitized by Google

seen the achievements of the House of Commons, of the Ecclesiastical Commission, of Privy Council, of irritated Prime Ministers, of weak and unguarded Archiepiscopal decisions, and of Episcopal vanity;—they had read or heard the futile ebullitions of some angry Archdeacon, who trespassed beyond his legitimate province of authority to arbitrate on doctrinal points, or to judge the liturgy of the universal Church, and they had even observed that the pulpit, after long and vigorous efforts, failed in throwing light on the subject, while vestries and popular tumults commonly left things in no better state than they found them. Oppressed and discouraged by these many sources of petty tyranny, there had been a craving in their minds for some large and constitutional power which should form a centre and a regulating Court of Appeal, in the midst of all this confusion of the Church's government. A stiff and imperious uniformity was not the remedy calculated to satisfy this craving, but rather a popular system of representation, such as from time to time might bring to bear the general wisdom, piety, and experience of Churchmen to the common good of the Church.

This state of feeling, we hesitate not to say, is a very prevalent result of the last twenty years' history of our Church, and accounts for the general anxiety long manifested in the revival of Convocation. A vague impression that this voice of the Church must act, caused inquiries and researches to be made into its history and province; and, on the occasion of the recent election, the Clergy first demanded that due notice should be given them of the time and place, contrary to the hole and corner system in which it had formerly been conducted; and then after many of the preparatory arrangements, which are common to all popular elections, such as the choice of candidates and of proposers and seconders, they assembled in great numbers to discharge an important ecclesiastical function. When there assembled, they heard from official lips, what sounded to many ears, the true charter of liberty they had imagined as but a visionary dream. We think it a great consideration to call the attention of our readers to these forms, because, if we wish to give life to Convocation as a whole, we must revive its parts and accessories. We must no longer take for granted that the registrar is engaged in mere form; we must quicken that form into an authoritative injunction, or the stigma of *mere form* may continue to be applied to the Archbishop's periodical visit to the Jerusalem Chamber. We do not agree, therefore, with one reporter in 'The Guardian,' that these forms are intolerably tedious, and require themselves the first hand of reforming power. The legal claims of the Church on our Constitution are

Digitized by Google

what we require to develop, and we ought to be most jealous of every detail that commits the State to the synodical action of the Church. The law is what we want, and must work on that tack with rigid perseverance. We must claim our pound of flesh; we must confront the powers that be with their own words, their bond, and promise. A little legal reiteration is not tiresome to those who feel the hold which their words give to the Church's advocates; the oftener some things are said the better, especially where people are dull of hearing, from the most potent of all reasons, that they won't hear.

We take for granted, where not expressly stated to the contrary, that the legal forms were read in all the recent elections. In the majority of reports it is distinctly said that they were, and we doubt whether it is not open to dispute the validity of an election not conducted in a formal manner. What is the nature of the meeting which elects the Proctors? It is not only a voluntary gathering together of so many Clergymen legally entitled to exercise the privilege of voting; but it is a Court; it is a Diocesan Synod, forming a Court for a particular purpose; it is commonly held in the Consistory Court, although its exact connexion with the other functions of that Court is a question not involved in our present subject. This Synod or Court is not to be compared with the use of the franchise in electing members of the civil parliament, for in that case the law does not order the use of the privilege, it only allows it. Whereas, the Clergy are cited in a formal manner, and pronounced contumacious if they do not appear; more after the style of summoning the grand jury at the opening of assizes. We observe that the terms 'Synod' and 'Court' were repeatedly used and in no case contradicted;—the Bishop of Oxford using the former word himself as an authoritative definition of the assembly. The form announcing the election in the words 'I pronounce so and so to be elected,' implies also that it is the judgment of a legal court.

In one instance, however, we have to notice rather a significant passing over of the formal part of the proceedings. Archdeacon Wigram, at Winchester, was so tender of wasting the time of his clergy, and so regardful of their convenience, that in the first place he avoided the Consistory Court, where such proceedings had usually been conducted; and in the next place, for the purpose of saving time, he proposed simply to read his Lordship's letter to himself, instead of following it up by a recital of the technical forms by which it was accompanied. Of the change of place we are able not to judge, not knowing the respective convenience of the Consistory Court in Winchester Cathedral, and the south aisle of the chancel; but, unless such adjournment

Digitized by Google

was very necessary, we think it has the appearance of endeavouring to make the whole affair as informal as possible, especially in connexion with the important omission of the legal forms. A letter from the Bishop of Winchester to Archdeacon Wigram, or even the whole correspondence between those dignitaries that arose out of the subject, may be very interesting; but we think those formalities which make the difference, between an irregular meeting of a few Clergy and a legal Court, would have been more to the point. Of this Archdeaconry, however, we shall have occasion to speak again.

The legal documents used are contained in a very convenient form in Mr. Pearce's little book, 'The Law relating to Convocations of the Clergy.' We shall not follow him in the history of their early institution, beyond stating that he entirely clears Convocation of the charge of being a mere instrument of taxation, as is often stated, for he proved its existence long before that particular part of its history becomes prominent. The plain state of the case appears to be that both secular and ecclesiastical parliaments were conducted in a very uncertain indefinite manner in their early history; but that in the reign of Edward I. their constitutions were made more regular, and have remained essentially the same from that time to this. As well, therefore, might we deny to the civil parliament the right of deliberation, because, in its early history, we find it chiefly called together for taxation, as deny the same right to Convocation, because we find it also to have been made more methodical in its constitution, in order to facilitate the raising of supplies from the Clergy.

The process of summoning Convocation begins from the Crown, who, at every dissolution of parliament, addresses the Archbishop of Canterbury in words, part of which we have already quoted, commanding him, by reason of certain difficult and urgent affairs, &c., to assemble in lawful manner the bishops, deans, archdeacons, chapters, and colleges, and the whole clergy of every diocese within his province, at St. Paul's, on a certain day. Our present Queen issued this writ the other day, ending in these words,—'And this as you love Us, the 'state of our kingdom, and honour and good of our aforesaid 'Church, by no means omit.' The expression 'in lawful manner' was inserted in the time of Henry VIII. instead of a particular order that chapters should be represented by one proctor, and the clergy of each diocese by two; but, as the custom was never altered, this change in the writ would not appear to have any meaning. A similar writ is issued to the Archbishop of York, and so jealous is the Queen, by law, of any cessation of this great synod of our Church, that if the Archbishop dies she forthwith, by special order, commands all

Digitized by Google

the clergy to come before his successor. In the province of York her haste, in accordance with legal precedent, is so great, that she will not risk any confusion among the Clergy, or any running away from their arduous duties of deliberation, by suffering Convocation to be without a President, even till the new Archbishop is appointed. At the death, therefore, of the late Archbishop of York, she forthwith wrote to the dean and chapter of the cathedral, commanding them to elect a President. This writ was signed 'by the Queen herself,' with her own hand.

With due thanks to the Queen for her concern on behalf of Convocation, and with the assurance to her advisers that the Church will bear in mind the importance which this official anxiety implies must be attached in our Constitution to her synodical action, we pass on to the next stage, viz.—what the Archbishop of Canterbury does when he has received these royal commands. He transmits them to the Bishop of London as Dean of the province of Canterbury, requiring him in that capacity to 'cite' all the bishops of the province, and through them all deans, archdeacons personally, chapters by one proctor, and the clergy by two. This is 'to treat of arduous and 'weighty affairs, which shall concern the state and welfare, public 'good and defence of this kingdom, and the subjects thereof, to 'be then and there seriously laid before them, and to give them 'their good counsel and assistance in the said affairs, and to 'consent to such things as shall happen to be wholesomely 'ordered and appointed by this common advisement for the 'honour of God and the good of the Church.' He further orders Charles James, Bishop of London, to intimate to all these suffragans and others, that they will not be excused from 'appearing in this affair of Convocation,' unless for some necessary cause alleged and approved, otherwise their contumacy will be canonically punished. Instigated by this authoritative command the Bishop of London then peremptorily admonishes all the suffragan bishops to cite the deans, archdeacons, &c., and the clergy of their dioceses to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of York does not act through a dean of the province, but communicates directly to the bishops, and the words actually used by him at the election of proctors in 1847, contrast oddly with the reception that met some few clergy, who were either simple enough to act on these solemn commands, or from various motives thought fit to present themselves as members of Convocation. After citing the deans, &c., and proctors of archdeacons to appear to give their wholesome advice, and 'to do and receive what the nature of this provincial 'Convocation shall demand and require,' he concludes,—'And 'we also intimate to you, and by you to the said dean and

Digitized by Google

'chapter, archdeacon, and the whole clergy aforesaid, to whom 'we would have it intimated by these presents, that neither you 'nor they are intended to be excused from your and their appear-'ances in the said Convocation in the manner aforesaid.'

The suffragan bishops pass on the above thunder of peremptory commands to the deans and chapters and archdeacons of their dioceses. The mandate to the archdeacons informs those astonished functionaries (if they believe what they read) that our Most Gracious Sovereign Lady, Victoria, &c., Queen, Defender of the Faith, has issued a writ 'for holding and 'celebrating a Sacred Synod and general Convocation of the 'Prelates and Clergy of the whole province.' Great preparations being naturally required before so important an event, the archdeacons are accordingly instructed to send proctors to appear at it. In the province of Canterbury those who hold ecclesiastical benefices and promotions are required to appear by their proctors, while in that of York the expression used is 'The whole clergy.'

We now come in the transmission of these commands, from one power to another, to that form in which *the whole clergy* have the subject presented before them. It is a sort of cumulative process, like the 'History of the House that Jack built.' Each stage includes at full length all those before it. The Clergy, therefore, hear the Queen's mandate, the Archbishop's, that of the Bishop of London, and of the bishop of the diocese, in addition to the archdeacon's own authority, if he happens to preside. In the first place the Clergy are cited by a formal document, for the presentation of which the apparitor is responsible, to appear at a certain time and place to appoint proctors, who, when in Convocation, are to treat, confer, and conclude of and upon those things, which then and there by mature deliberation shall be agreed upon for the honour of God and the good of the Church. To all these peremptory monitions there are due returns made after the business is concluded, certifying that such commands have been obeyed.

As in this stage of the affair we have to do with the constituency and not with the Church's elected parliament, it is important that it should be clearly laid down how the Clergy generally have a right to be represented. On many points, there are irregularities by custom or negligence, which materially hinder the full development of the representative idea, or prevent its efficiency. If Convocation is an important power when assembled, we must have a proportional concern in the election of its component parts, especially as there are so many *ex officio* members, who may swamp the popular elements of the assembly. We propose, therefore, now that we have deduced from the legal writs their forcible and imperative signification, to discuss

Digitized by Google

some few topics of doubt or complaint, which have arisen out of the actual proceedings, just concluded, in the election of Proctors. Having done this, we shall give a general summary of the election, that will show how great a victory the advocates of Convocation have gained, although all the difficulties were undeniably against, rather than in favour of their cause.

In the first place, a habit had naturally grown up, during the indifference attached to the whole subject, of giving very insufficient notice to the Clergy, as to the time and place for the election of Proctors. This grievance was loudly expressed beforehand, and in many places requisitions or private communications were forwarded to those in authority, requesting that due notice might be given. The custom had often been, for an advertisement to be put in the county paper, on the Saturday, perhaps, announcing the election of a Proctor on the Monday morning; or notice was put on one church door, just at the time when all the Clergy would necessarily be in their respective churches and parishes. In most cases, this wish was responded to with a good grace, as not only a fair and just desire, but a legal right. Letters were in most cases sent to each Clergyman who ought to be present, and in the diocese of Oxford an acknowledgment of its receipt was requested. We need not discuss here, what is the peculiar province of the Apparitor, as to whether the post-office is a legal method of serving a writ or citation, but it is important that the notice must be looked on as obligatory, and not only as an announcement which, in the eye of the law, may be responded to or not, at the will of the recipient. There is a legal penalty attached to the contempt of it, which proves the formal and synodical character of the assembly thereby summoned, and which therefore must not be overlooked. In the precedents before us, eight days is the time given between the citation and the election; and it ought not to be less than that, considering the distance that many have to come. In some cases, however, the snug system was persevered in, even during the late election, and complaints were uttered at the election itself, of the wretched sort of notice which had been given. In the Archdeaconry of Stafford it was stated at the election that no notice had been given, but by an advertisement in the paper, which was not felt to be enough. In the Archdeaconry of Wells, the only notice given, was through a paper put on the door of the Archdeacon's own church, which was a great violation even of courtesy, if we bear in mind how many of that Archdeaconry would be well known as anxious to attend.

The question next arises as to who are to be cited, that is, who have a right to vote in the election? This was a fruitful

Digitized by Google

subject of discussion in very many of the meetings; but, as a preliminary to any expressed opinions one way or the other, it is needful to remember, that the real question before us is, not one of abstract propriety, but of legal right. The enjoyment of a franchise must be regulated, and is regulated by certain rules, which, for the time, are binding. When it is thought that such rules may be beneficially reformed, they may, by competent authority be altered; but, till then, it will never answer any good purpose to tender illegal votes, however it may be thought that such votes ought to be valid. The acceptance of them might disarrange an election, and take away from the formal legal character of the affair, as an ecclesiastical court; it might create an indefinite notion in people's minds of the whole right of franchise, and convert the *synod* into an ordinary clerical meeting.

We think, indeed, it can hardly be doubted, that licensed curates ought to have votes; but it is certainly open to a question, whether they legally have at present. The arguments in their favour, as regards the abstract right, rest on the dignity and claims of the clerical office itself, as not being dependent upon the holding of benefices. It is part of the *establishment* tendency to exalt the beneficed clergy, at the expense of the pure cleric. And more than this: whether Convocation was or was not originally a body summoned for fiscal purposes, it is unquestionable that one, and often its chief duty, of raising taxes from the clergy, would restrict its members to those who had benefices to be taxed. Again, if we would aim generally at a fair representation of the Church, it is surely just that a large parish with several Clergy, should have greater weight than a very small one. Yet there can be but one Incumbent to a parish, be it great or small. The remedy then of this inequality is, plainly to give votes to the Clergy who are licensed to assist Incumbents, according to the arduous nature of their duties. This is self-adapting, because the number of curates, and therefore of votes, would always be adapting itself to the size and importance of the place; whereas an incumbency is a fixed unity, which remains the same through many ups and downs in the prosperity of the parish. Such are sufficient reasons in favour of the abstract right of licensed curates; there are also some in favour of their present legal claim. The legal writs that proceed from the fountain head of authority, and which therefore are of more ancient precedent, are decidedly in their favour. The Queen's writ names 'the whole Clergy,' and this applies to the two provinces. The Archbishop of Canterbury's writ to the Bishop of London also says, 'the whole Clergy,' but in this province

Digitized by Google

this *general* expression stops here, for it is interpreted in the further writs, even that of the Archbishop to his own Archdeacons, as 'elective Rectors and others, having and possessing Ecclesiastical Benefices and Promotions.' In the province of York, the expression, 'the whole Clergy,' is retained in the Archbishop's mandate to the Bishops, while in the writs to Archdeacons there is added, 'and all and singular others who anciently used to be called, cited, and admonished.'

In the province of York, therefore, the curates' claim stands on a better footing; and the Archdeacon of the East Riding did not hesitate to receive them. In the province of Canterbury it may fairly be asked, By what right was the larger expression converted into the more defined one, at what period was it done, and what precedent is there for it? If that precedent goes very far back, it would be useless to deny its legality, however we might appeal to the original words, in arguing a reform; the legality of it must, therefore, at present rest on length of custom, which, in one case often quoted, was said to date as far back as the year 1588. But another question may fairly be asked,—May not the same authority which received the incumbents of district churches, though not legally beneficed clergymen, also receive licensed curates? If the one was legal, why not the other? The ancient precedents, if they are in favour only of beneficed clergymen, could not be extended to the incumbents of district churches by any construction which would not equally apply to curates; for districts were not in existence when those precedents were established, and therefore, no peculiar provision could be made for them: nor do we imagine that precedents of only a recent date are binding, as such, one way or the other. On the supposition, then, that the relaxation of the words 'beneficed clergy,' legally includes district churches, we claim also for curates. The pecuniary distinction, however, of a freehold, which perpetual curacies are, remains.

The only diocese of the province of Canterbury where curates' votes were taken in the recent election, was that of Hereford; which was stated to be on the ground that they had been so taken at former elections. Claims were made, and protests entered in very many instances, as in the archdeaconry of Middlesex, at Bristol, Bangor, Rochester, Peterborough, Dorchester, S. Asaph. The diocese of Manchester is the only one in the province of York, where curates are stated definitely (according to the reports before us) to have had their claims refused. At Durham and Carlisle it is said, that several curates were present; but, as the elections were unanimous, their right of voting was not tested. We think it the greater pity that the Bishop of Manchester should have refused them, as he started proceedings, by

claiming a certain happy exemption from the trammels of precedent, alleging this as a reason for conducting business in the manner that, on general grounds, he most approved. As his Lordship, however, does not appear to have agreed very well with his curates, it is no wonder that he preferred dispensing with their counsel on this occasion.

Another question which claims consideration, as materially affecting the fair representation of the parochial clergy, is the fresh division of dioceses. It has been alleged in the recent election, on several occasions, that the local rights, which ancient districts possessed in the return of Proctors, ought not to be interfered with by changes in ecclesiastical divisions, for which the consent of Convocation has not been given. It would be going very far back, and would be impracticable as a general rule, to disannul all Church legislation that has not thus been sanctioned; and therefore, we must be content to let bygones be bygones; but still these opportunities are very favourable for exposing the injustice of a power external to the Church, and not recognising more of the Church's position than suits its purpose, making changes and fresh arrangements, irrespective of the Church's own voice in the subject. There has been gross injustice in many of these changes, as in the united diocese of Gloucester and Bristol; but that is another question, and the election of Proctors is so small a part of the wrong, that we should not care for rectifying it, unless Bristol again was the seat of a Bishop, and thus the greater wrong was also remedied. As an occasion, however, of protest, or even of some sort of investigation which might show a legal flaw in the late mode, which has been adopted in ecclesiastical legislation, we think the grievances of being deprived of a certain franchise may be applied to a useful purpose. Still, where the larger alteration is sanctioned, and irrevocably fixed,—where a diocese is really and actually changed, it is obvious that the machinery in lesser matters, which belongs to a diocese generally, had better be conceded to it, unless, on legal and constitutional grounds, some object can be gained by another course. A mere concession of this, especially when laid down by legal authority to be right, can hardly damage the general position of Convocation. But as a legal question there seems, nevertheless, to be some doubt whether the alteration of dioceses, not authorized by Convocation, can affect the electing of Proctors, although the responsibility of a contrary decision must rest with the Bishops, in the issuing of their mandates. At Worcester it was contended that Coventry ought not to elect in its new diocese, and the opinion of eminent lawyers was said to be in favour of this, and also it was stated that at the two last elections, which have

Digitized by Google

occurred since the general alteration, Essex had continued to vote with London, though, when adverting to the present diocese of Rochester, we shall see that such is not the case this time. Another rather questionable mode of election in a diocese, which is yet very generally adopted, is dividing the whole diocese into two parts, apportioning one Proctor to each division. The legal mandates all require two Proctors to be chosen by the diocese, in the same manner that two members of Parliament are to be returned by a county. Each voter has then a voice in two candidates, whereas by an arbitrary apportioning of a single representative to his own peculiar district this double interest is destroyed. We are not sufficiently prepared with the history of the modes of election in each diocese, so as to judge of the amount of authority there may be for this proceeding, or the length of time there may be to establish this custom in certain dioceses; but considering how very probable it is, that, during the small interest taken in the whole question for several generations, many lax and irregular modes of conducting business have crept in, it is wise for the Clergy to be upon their guard against any customs which interfere with their rights. They need not take for granted that arrangements of this kind have ancient authority, seeing how great a probability there is that they have been mere recent expedients to save trouble, without any idea that the individual rights of the Clergy were at all thought of.

In some cases the division is not equal. The diocese of Norwich is thus divided, and the two archdeaconries of Norfolk send one, while the single archdeaconry of part of Suffolk sends the other. A Norfolk clergyman has thus a less share in the selection of a Proctor than is legally awarded to him, as living in the diocese. It is difficult to account for the variety of custom in different dioceses. Sometimes this may arise from local distinctions, that are older than the modelling of Convocation by Edward I., and which may have been suffered to remain, where not interfering with the general province of Convocation. There is no reason why each diocese should return its Proctors exactly in the same manner, and where ancient custom has established a certain mode of proceeding, it would be unnecessary to violate it, for the sake of a mere paper uniformity; but on the other hand there is no reason why a habit that results only from a period of indifference, should meet with any respect. There is one decided objection to this mode; which is, that the influence of the Bishop, or private interest of any kind, may vary in different parts of a diocese, and therefore Proctors may be returned without that general balance of opposite parties and impartial interests, which space will give. This mode of proceeding was, in the recent election, adopted in only four dioceses of the

southern province; Winchester, Chichester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Norwich. In the election at Canterbury, it would appear that such an arrangement was meditated, and nominally one Proctor was returned for each archdeaconry, but the election for both was at the same time and place; and when the claim was formerly made for all the Clergy to vote for both, it was ruled that they could; which is an important precedent. In the dioceses of Hereford and Asaph, again, although the Proctors are returned as each for an archdeaconry, the election was common and shared in by all alike. The case of Bristol is mixed up so entirely with the question of new divisions in dioceses, that we can hardly gather any rule from it under our present head. The question we have just considered is, however, of small importance compared with another mode of election, which is adopted in the dioceses of London, Lichfield, Salisbury, and, with peculiar aggravation, of Rochester. The mere division of the diocese into archdeaconries, does allow each individual vote to have a direct voice in the selection of one who will thereby be a Proctor of Convocation; but in the above-mentioned dioceses, the Clergy only elect a sort of committee, out of which the real Proctors are chosen. This is obviously subversive of all true representation; and whatever may be the origin of it, it is plainly an abuse, and an act of injustice to the diocesan clergy. The custom may arise from two sources: it may be simply an adopted mode of electing two Proctors with an intermediate process, set up by an ingenious Bishop; or it may, in some cases, be the remains of an ancient right, by which each archdeaconry elects two for itself, as in the province of York; the right being retained in its first stage, till it necessarily came in contact with the general rule, perhaps of a later date, in the history of the national synod, that each diocese should only return two. These are interesting questions of research, which no doubt will be examined in a work already promised on the subject by a member of the present Convocation; but which we are unable in these pages to discuss with any certainty as an historical point. The plain injustice, however, of being represented second-hand, should sweep away any difficulties that might occur of a formal kind; and when Convocation meets, we doubt not that this will be one of its first reforms. In the diocese of Lichfield, this method of being represented, was the source of much just complaint on the part of the Clergy in the Archdeaconry of Stafford. Questions were asked, which showed how little was known by the Clergy as to the further selection of the acting Proctors. It was imagined that the Dean and Chapter politely aided in this department, and all the answer that could be obtained was, that some system of rotation had been the custom; as if it was any satisfaction, at a particular event of Church

politics, for an incumbent who was not then actually represented, to be informed, that in due course of our septennial Parliaments, the living he then filled would come to its turn of being represented. We believe, however, that on the present occasion, eight elected by the Archdeaconries did themselves choose the two who were to represent them. The same complaints were forcibly made by the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wilts, and, as the event proved, not without good reason, for neither of their nominees were finally chosen, the lot falling on the two elected by the Archdeaconry of Sarum, Mr. Caswell, and Mr. Lowther; most excellent and fit men indeed, but for that reason men who would be first to object to the mode of their own election. Here again we believe the final selection to have been made by the whole six, which is a very much less abuse than the custom in the diocese of Rochester, which we next consider. This diocese consists of four archdeaconries, who return eight Proctors, from whom the Bishop of Rochester selects two. The popular element ceases, therefore, altogether with the first election, and the further choice has not the pretence of being simply an intermediate step for the sake of convenience. In that diocese the parochial clergy are represented in almost an infinitesimal proportion, if we go through all the members of Convocation which proceed from it. The bishop, the dean, by some strange accident two chapters' proctors, and four archdeacons, making altogether seven, are on the one side, while even the two whom the parochial clergy select, are chosen by the bishop out of eight. The parochial clergy, therefore, may return three-fourths of its Proctors of one way of thinking, and yet, at the arbitrary will of the bishop, they may be represented entirely by Proctors of another way of thinking. Nor can we always trust to the good taste of our bishops, to avoid so glaring an outrage on the feelings of their clergy, when the power is before them of advancing their own side of the question. We have mentioned eight dioceses in the province of Canterbury, in which there seem to be irregularities in the fair and direct representation of the parochial clergy. In the remaining thirteen, the whole diocese joined in the general election of two representatives, who were thereby pronounced actual members of Convocation. In these cases the proceedings on the whole were of a much more satisfactory and agreeable nature. There was less complaint, and the synodical element of the Church was more realized in the minds of those who were present, as witness the election at Oxford. Vexatious dictation, as at Stafford, did not advance its own cause, but only provoked an inharmonious character in the proceedings; while in Oxford, the diocesan idea prevailed in establishing universal good feeling, though some points in the management of the business were strictly and justly canvassed.

Digitized by Google

But it would seem that the mode of election in each diocese need not be so exactly guided by precedent as that the bishop may not alter it, for in both cases just specially mentioned, the respective Bishops of Oxford and Rochester had occasion from a change in their dioceses to exercise their individual discretion. The circumstances appear to have been exactly the same, and therefore a comparison of their practical decision is the more interesting. In each case one or more archdeaconries had lately been added to the diocese, which brought with them the custom of electing two Proctors preparatory to a final choice; that choice, in the new archdeaconries added to Oxford, having been exercised by the archidiaconal Proctors, and in those added to Rochester from London, by the Bishop of London. It remained, therefore, with the bishops to decide whether the old custom of their sees, that of appointing two for the whole diocese, should now prevail and include the additions, or whether the custom of those additions should be adopted as the general rule for the diocese as at present constituted. It is honourable to the Bishop of Oxford that he made the addition yield to the custom of the old diocese, coming to this decision openly on the ground that such a mode of election was most fair, as it gave each clergyman a direct vote for an actual member of Convocation. The Bishop of Rochester decided otherwise, and made all his diocese adapt itself to the custom of the new archdeaconries. It may have been that the custom in this case was more tempting than in the other, inasmuch as the final choice was on the magnificent principle of an episcopal veto, and that the dignity of the Church was thought to be involved in maintaining episcopal power against a faithless age; but still, taking an external view of the two proceedings, we must confess that as the results are in striking contrast, so would the epithets by which we would characterise the responsible agents be of equally contrary meaning, if we thought it wise to speak anything but that which is good of those in high spiritual authority.

There are a number of minor points which were suggested by the Clergy at the different meetings, or which appear on the face of the reports, but to enlarge on them would be beyond our space. In some cases rules were laid down, by the Chancellors or others, of the details of business, all of which will be useful at a future time; but more frequently we meet only with the suggestion of questions, which may perhaps receive more definite answers on another occasion. We will mention a few of these, but must content ourselves with the bare notice of them. Pluralists were ruled to have but one vote, which is useful to remember as bearing on the curates' question; for in the first place it shows that it is the individual

cleric who votes, and not the holder of a benefice; and in the next place, it proves an injustice from the entire loss of a vote, if the curate, where the rector is non-resident, cannot represent the clerical rights in this respect. There is a peculiar custom in most of the citations to name two hours, between which the election must take place; and when this was the case it was decided that a candidate might be proposed at any time within those hours, and consequently that the election could not be declared before the whole time was expired, however soon the business was really concluded. Any clergyman coming in before the time was up was held to clear himself of his contumacy, though a Proctor might be elected, who was absent.

It was suggested by a clergyman in the archdeaconry of London, that any clerk might be elected Proctor without belonging himself to the diocese which he would represent; and if there is any analogy between civil and ecclesiastical parliaments this must certainly be the case. Questions were in several places asked as to whether the Proctors could receive petitions on the occasion of their election, in order that they might present them before Convocation. This was generally refused, and we think justly; for, if allowed, the meetings would have departed from their strict legal character of being a Court or Synod convened for a special purpose, namely, to elect Proctors, and would have merged, dangerously perhaps in the present state of things, into too irregular an assembly. Moreover, we do not see any motive for wishing it, except the mere convenience of a certain number of Clergy being together, which could be easily taken advantage of by announcing another meeting of a voluntary description to come after the formal act, and at which a petition could be drawn up and given to the Proctor. This was actually done in the archdeaconry of Lindisfarne, in the diocese of Durham. Where, however, the Archdeacon himself, as President of the Synod, thinks fit to receive a memorial to the Queen, and himself signs it, as was the case at Durham, we must hold that to be legal, and within the province of the Synod, in the same way that it was successfully claimed by the Bishop of Exeter, at the last meeting of Convocation, on the obvious ground of necessity, that a synod may deliberate to petition for the royal licence, without being amenable to the law which forbids, not the transaction of business, but the passing of Canons.

The place of meeting varies much, but the consistory court is most proper, any other being either a substitute for it, and so far made to be one for the time, or an adjournment from it. The Bishop of Manchester, we think very improperly, selected the chancel of the Church, himself sitting on the north of the altar, a proceeding which cannot have been necessary or seemly.

Digitized by Google

In a discussion at Devizes, it was stated that, in ecclesiastical business, it was not necessary to have seconders to any motion. What foundation there is for this we know not, except it simply be the privilege of members in a legal court to dispense with some conventional modes of conducting public business, if they please to do so. At S. David's, the vote of an Archdeacon, as such, was protested against; and on very good grounds, as Archdeacons are themselves members of Convocation. On one other minor point, as we find the proceedings reported, there was great difference of usage. In some places there was an introductory full service; in others, the Litany, as in the East Riding; in others, the business was opened by prayer of the same description that precedes a public meeting; while at other places there were no prayers at all, which, perhaps, is the best plan, where the regular daily service of the Church is offered up in due course within the same walls, and also under the present circumstances of our Church, which forbid any pliability of service to suit an occasion of this kind, without verging on an irregular tone of proceeding that would be inconsistent with the legal dignity of a Synod, collected for the appointment of Proctors to Convocation.

One most important claim was made very frequently during the proceedings we are now reviewing, and was in some cases unjustly refused; we mean the right of questioning candidates, on their being proposed. Any irrelevant discussion ought certainly to be checked, but it is a clear and obvious right in any popular election that the candidates should make their views known, as a guide to the voters in exercising their franchise. In some cases, this was successfully claimed, and the right legally sanctioned; but in others it was altogether repressed. The Archdeacon of Middlesex, at first, declared all questions to be irrelevant; but, ultimately, allowed a candidate to answer for himself without the question being put from the chair, which is clearly the proper course to pursue, though we should have given him more credit if he had found that out himself without waiting till it was forced upon him. In claiming for the meeting the character of a Court or Synod, we do not in the least desire that the Archdeacon, or whoever may be in the chair, should be the exclusive medium of all that is said or done. His office is to keep order; to see that a certain object is being accomplished by a fair and legal process; to do certain legal acts, as himself part of the transaction, and, at the end, to pronounce the decision that has been come to; but the Synod itself is, in its nature, a place of popular discussion. It is a process toward a given end, and all necessary discussion which tends to that end is included in the general object of the meeting. In the Archdeaconry of Lewes, the Chancellor laid down as a legal point,

that any elector might offer remarks on the subject; and, considering the essential equality of all voters, as being cited to exercise a certain synodical power, we cannot imagine on what ground any other conclusion could be arrived at. The actual power of the whole affair rests with the assembled Clergy who have votes. They are cited to elect Proctors as part of a system of popular representation, and, subject to certain legal conditions of relevancy to a given end, they may do what they like, and talk among themselves as they like: indeed, it is quite optional whether they adopt the ordinary conventional practices of public meetings or not—those practices, we mean, which simply facilitate business without being in their nature essential, as that no one shall speak except according to a certain program. In a public meeting, the committee, who calls it, is the acting power for the time being; and they, as having possession of the room, may prohibit any one from speaking but whom they invite; but in Synod the whole meeting are in the place of such committee, or of a jury in a court of justice; for all have an absolute right to be present, and are not there on sufferance.

The same permission was granted by the Archdeacon of Craven, and tacitly allowed by the Bishop of Norwich; but there were several important occasions on which it was absolutely refused, which we must also notice. The most prominent cases, for we pass over several, where speakers were stopped, on the ground of diverging from the subject, are the meetings at Oxford, Devizes, and Manchester. We regret that the Bishop of Oxford was so imperative on this subject, as his dictum was adduced in subsequent elections, and had influence as coming from him. Moreover, it was inconsistent with his own claim that the meeting was a Synod, for himself, as Bishop, to speak, and for the priests to be silent. At Devizes the Archdeacon also checked questioning with summary authority, in spite of a very general feeling among all present that they had a right to ask the candidate certain questions. 'The Guardian' appends the following judicious remarks on the subject to its report of the meeting:—

'The decision of the Archdeacon, although agreeing with the course taken by the Bishop of Oxford, is palpably mistaken; for the archiepiscopal mandate is, that the Clergy choose *fit* and *proper* Proctors; and the very notion of choosing implies certainly the liberty of examining, and, as the Clergy cannot possibly ascertain who will be nominated before the actual business is before them, it follows that they have full liberty to examine the views of those nominated, and to put questions to them. The power of examining is *necessary* to the due fulfilment of the duty laid before them. To perform high and solemn duties carelessly, and *as a mere matter of form*, is a grave moral offence.'

The Bishop of Manchester, also, took the line of the proceedings being purely ministerial, and that therefore discussion was

quite beside the point. This word *ministerial*—it has acquired a certain infamy from its abuse in the Hampden case—was ingeniously chosen by the Bishop, inasmuch as it would require some little thought, on the part of those who heard, to see its exact bearing on their position, and meanwhile they would let the opportunity pass. It was not an epithet which would bring down immediate or personal retaliation, and it has its portion of truth, inasmuch as all public responsibilities are, in one sense, to be performed ministerially. The logical error, however, seems to be in supposing, that doing a thing ministerially, is in all cases to do it without the aid of human reason, or without any natural process in which the will is brought into action. Her Majesty's Ministers do not, when they act ministerially, consider themselves excluded from all exercise of thought or judgment. The Bishop's purpose, no doubt, was to tell the clergy, under the guise of a certain conventional meaning often given to the word *ministerial*, that they were instruments acting under his own directions; whereas we should rather take the other view, that the word ministerial more properly applies to the chairman of a meeting, who has to receive and pronounce the judgment of others, than to those in whom the power of free choice is actually vested. One speaker here was frivolously, and in an arbitrary manner, stopped, on the ground of discussing Convocation in too general a point of view. It is impossible to state the opinions of a candidate without touching on the principal question in the minds of all present. Great scope must be given on all hustings for the discussing of general subjects.

Having now reviewed the more general and technical points suggested by the recent election of Proctors, we propose to take a political and ecclesiastical view of the whole affair; to examine the principle on which the Clergy gave their votes, with the general issue that followed so strange a revival of ecclesiastical electioneering as this summer has witnessed.

Till this recent election, the idea of a contest was hardly thought of for an office which meant so little when held. But this time there have been twenty-three real cases of opposition, in which the election was decided by votes; this number being nearly half of all the meetings called for the parochial clergy. The very great majority of Proctors thus appointed, who stand committed to the cause of Convocation, must suggest the inquiry, why the known opponents of it were not more active on their side. In the first place, we have now a right to assume that numerically the Convocation party is the largest, and that the opponents shrank from a contest, knowing they should be beaten. In the next place, the inactive or neutral portion of the Clergy, who hitherto have rather been felt as a dead weight against Convocation, now are simply omitted from the whole

Digitized by Google

calculation. Before the question was really put and tried, their influence was supposed to be in favour of the opponents, simply because there was this common ground between them, that both desired to do nothing. Now, however, that something is actually being done, the neutral, who still do nothing, leave the vigorous opponents in their true nakedness. There is also an unwillingness in all opponents of Convocation, to encourage a contest on the subject, from the consciousness that a struggle will necessarily bring the question into dangerous familiarity with the public mind; in fact, they see, as we have stated before, that a fight about it is in itself a great step in advance, even if the cause should meet with a temporary defeat. In many dioceses there were attempts at opposition, which never came to light for this very reason, as well as on general grounds of the small probability of success.

That our readers may judge of the great unanimity which has been shown by the parochial clergy in favour of Convocation, we will lay before them the general abstract, given by the 'John Bull' newspaper, of the Elections. This journal has done good service to the cause, by a certain vigour with which it treats any subject that it takes in hand; but we cannot altogether repress our regret at the very intolerant and illiberal spirit in which other religious questions are dealt with. We regret this, not on abstract grounds of alarm, that the virulence, and almost amusingly rabid, vituperation of other religious bodies, should seriously check the consistent working out of the principle of toleration, which as we have adopted, we must retain; but we regret to see the cause of Convocation in the hands of such advocates. As a matter of policy, we prefer that the claimants of our Church's freedom should not themselves be the bigoted invokers of the arm of the law against the synodical conclaves and edicts of another church, however bad we may think the taste of that church may be in foreing itself upon public notice as Rome has lately done.

The general summary which this paper gives of the Election will suffice for our present purpose, though the carefully collected table of the whole list of new Proctors is a valuable memorandum to keep at hand. We also commend the comments which are made after the complete list, as an introduction to the summary.

'This table is not yet as complete as we could wish. One of the absurdities which the officials endeavour to perpetuate is the secrecy observed respecting the names of the Proctors. Nothing can be more ridiculous than that a matter of public concern, such as the election of persons to serve in a public assembly, should be made a matter of mystery and concealment. Of right there ought to be an official publication of the members composing the new Convocation, and at all events no difficulties ought to

be thrown in the way of those who are endeavouring to supply the public with authentic information. We shall still be glad to receive from any one able to furnish it, such information respecting the names which are missing in the above table, and respecting their views on the revival of Convocation, as may enable us to make the list complete in every respect. In the meantime we may now commence summing up the results, as far as the Proctors for the parochial Clergy are concerned.

'In the Province of Canterbury there appear to be—

'Members of Convocation favourable to the revival	35
Unfavourable	5
Neutral or unknown	2
	42

'This shows a majority in favour of the revival of seven to one; but this majority is still more decided, on reckoning up all the Proctors elected. Taking into account those whose election indicates the feeling of the electors, though they have no seats in Convocation, we arrive at the following results:—

'Members of Convocation favourable as above .	35
Proctors elected, but who will not sit, favourable to the revival	15
Total of returns favourable to the revival . .	50

'On the other side one only has to be added to the number of those who are unfavourable, and the numbers therefore are, 50 favourable, and 6 unfavourable, which is in the proportion of more than 8 to 1.

'In the Province of York we have—

'Members of Convocation favourable to the revival	15
Proctors to be selected from the three Archdeaconries of the diocese of Durham, all favourable	3
	18

'Against these eighteen, who are decidedly favourable, the entire Province produces only one that is neutral, neither an advocate for the revival, nor a violent opponent. Taking into account all the returns, we have—

'Members of Convocation favourable, as above .	18
Proctors who will not sit, for the Diocese of Durham, all favourable	3
One of the Proctors in the double return for the Archdeaconry of Richmond	1
Total favourable	22

'Against these twenty-two favourable, there is in the whole Province of York but one neutral, as before stated, and one decidedly unfavourable, being the opposition candidate for the Archdeaconry of Richmond.'

This summary may or may not be exact, therefore we also give a more general one from a leading article of the 'Morning Chronicle:'—

'Our contemporaries have been for some time busily attempting to decide the question what proportion of the Lower House is in favour of synodical action. We believe that all such attemps are premature, or, at best, that they can be but very rough approximations to the fact. Nevertheless, as we shall probably be expected to follow the example of our neighbours, we will state at once our own opinion, and its grounds. We

shall embrace the Convocations of both provinces in one view. Their present constitution is as follows—twenty-nine deans, seventy-one archdeacons, thirty-one capitular, and sixty-six parochial Proctors. Now, among the parochial Proctors, who alone fairly represent the unrestricted and unbiassed mind of English Churchmen, the majority in favour of synodical action is perfectly overwhelming. About fifty we know to be pledged to its cause; and we are fully justified in assuming that half of the remaining sixteen are also its friends. Of the deans and capitular Proctors—who, as being appointed by the same kind of influence, may be classed together—we shall only claim one-fourth, which will add fifteen to our numbers. Of the archdeacons—who are, generally speaking, a very different set of men—the best judgment which we are able to form induces us to set down a third, or twenty-four, as advocates of Church action. Thus, out of the 197 members of whom the Convocation consists, we reckon that ninety-seven are in favour of its efficiency; and this number—paradox though it may seem—is amply sufficient for a good working majority. For it must be remembered that the hundred whom we assume to be on the opposite side include all the dead weight of the Church. A large proportion of these gentlemen might, indeed, if they were present, oppose free action; but they will certainly not take the trouble of travelling one or two hundred miles to ensure inaction. A large proportion also hold their present tenets simply because they believe them to be those of the majority. Deducting both these classes, we shall find very few, indeed, who are determined and active opponents of synodical freedom; and the *primâ facie* hundred antagonists will have dwindled into a very small and miserable minority.'

It now remains for us to notice a few of the principal contests, with such circumstances that occurred as may give interest or value to them. First, we shall take the favourable ones, which will occupy but small space, for the simple fact that such and such men are returned, who will advocate the cause of Convocation, is the main point. The preponderance of new members is, however, an important fact, thus commented on by 'The Morning Chronicle:'—

'In the list of Convocation which we published on Wednesday, one of the most remarkable features is the extraordinary preponderance, among the parochial Proctors, of new names. In the province of Canterbury, only sixteen old members out of forty-two have been returned; and in that of York, only eight out of twenty-four. It is very encouraging to find that a large proportion of the new representatives are known as men of mark and talent—men not allied to this party or to that, but, in their various ways, zealous and energetic for the efficiency of the Church. In fact, the present Convocation is emphatically a working one. It will cut out work for itself, and do it, too, if it be allowed; and if not, it will cut out plenty of work for those who repress its energies. If it be the serious intention of the Premier to suppress the Ecclesiastical Parliament of 1852, we do not at all envy his feelings on contrasting the stuff of which this assembly is composed with that of previous Synods—with men who, scarcely knowing whether they were Proctors or not, contented themselves with periodically reading that such of their brethren as happened to be in town had voted a sleepy address to the Crown, and had been prorogued.'

The diocese of Canterbury is honoured by two favourable representatives, Mr. Chesshyre and Dr. Mill, between which last

Digitized by Google

and another candidate the contest lay. Dr. Mill gained his election by thirty votes to ten. It is a singular and suggestive phenomenon that the diocese of Dr. Sumner should return so eminent, but so determined a high Churchman, as Dr. Mill. The archdeaconry of London divided its favour for and against, in the persons of Mr. Toogood and Dr. M'Caul; but the latter only kept out a second favourable candidate, Mr. Bazely, by one vote. In the archdeaconry of Surrey Mr. Randolph was preferred to Mr. Dalton, which proves a peculiar determination to have the most energetic advocate of Convocation to represent them; for the defeated candidate can hardly be called an opponent. At Ely there were five candidates; three favourable and two the reverse. Mr. Rickards and Mr. Fendall, strong advocates, were returned; while the two whose views were not so understood, were in a decided minority. In the archdeaconry of Bristol, with 130 Clergy present, the opposition candidate gained but small success in the show of hands, having only twelve in his favour. At Hereford the Professor of Pastoral Theology, Dr. Ogilvie, and the Hon. and Rev. O. Forester, found themselves with respectively sixteen and nine votes, against forty-four and forty in favour of Mr. Jebb and Mr. Joyce, who were favourable to Convocation. At Derby, Mr. Pole and Mr. Anson were returned, on the same interest; and Mr. Cavendish and Mr. Abney, with all the Evangelical party to support them, were defeated. At Lincoln 150 clergy were present, and a most animated and well-conducted debate followed; but Mr. Massingbird and Mr. Knapp, the advocates of Convocation, were triumphantly returned on that ground; their numbers being eighty-three and sixty-nine, against Mr. Bird's forty-three. This instance is a valuable testimony that the popular feeling of the Clergy is in favour of the cause. It was a fair, open contest, in which both parties really came forward and showed their strength. At Worcester, two most favourable candidates were elected, Mr. Woodgate and Mr. Seymour, against a strong opposition, and in spite of what may easily be imagined would be the episcopal influence. At Norwich also, Mr. Hills was unanimously returned, although the Bishop has lately delivered a Charge, the whole burden of which is against Convocation. In the province of York, Mr. Howard and Canon Trevor were returned by a large majority at York, against the two former Proctors, who, as they did not appear on that occasion, so were well known to have no intention of making the office a very active one, even if chosen. In the archdeaconry of East Riding, sixty Clergy were present; and the numbers were thirty-four and twenty-eight in favour of the two candidates on the revival side, and twenty-two for the opponent; and in that of Craven, Dr. Hook and Mr. Bell were returned on the same

Digitized by Google

interest, by a large majority, against the old Proctors, who neither had done nor would do anything in performance of their office.

No case is more illustrative of the popularity among the Clergy of the revival cause, than that of Manchester. There were 150 present; and in spite of the very prompt manner in which the episcopal arm was held up the very moment that any one dared to commence a free and reasonable discussion, it was generally understood that Mr. Darnford and Mr. Hornby were the popular men. The name of Stowell would indeed seem to be a formidable competitor when backed by the echoes of approbation resounding from Exeter Hall, and himself lately made honorary Canon by his bishop; an organized party, with Mr. Masters and Mr. Stowell to stand side by side, would be thought insuperable. It might also occur to some that as Mr. Stowell is so fond of declamation himself, and therefore must be of opinion that the Church may be greatly benefited by the art of public oratory, so of course he would be desirous of an open field for discussion in the Church's own machinery, and would be a strong advocate of Convocation. He could hardly, again, be thought to object on the often-mentioned plea that the parochial clergy had better keep to their own parishes, than trouble themselves about public affairs; but still it was felt that the traditions of Convocation did not exactly suit the Stowell party; and curiously enough, the Clergy of Manchester thought also that he would not suit Convocation; for the numbers were for Darnford and Hornby seventy-one and sixty-six, while Masters and Stowell recorded but forty and thirty-nine. Surely this was a strong hint to the Bishop, that his Clergy, even though acting *ministerially*, had a will of their own, and were desirous, in general matters, of providing the Church with an expression of the Clergy's just influence.

We have now seen many instances of large assemblies of the Clergy, when acting without any overwhelming external bias, uniformly electing Proctors favourable to the revival of Convocation. But before we claim this as the universal issue of such popular contests, we must examine those which terminated unfavourably. Taking the 'John Bull's' list, we find only four cases in which actual elections (not dependent on a further choice) did so terminate. Without asserting that a decided advocacy of the cause was shown in all other instances, we shall yet confine our remarks to those four, as at any rate being the prominent non-revival cases, dwelling more peculiarly on one which is most to our purpose, because there was a large meeting, and the Clergy were fully alive to the whole affair. These four unsuccessful contests were at Winchester, Chichester, Lewes, and S. David's; which we shall consider in the reverse order of their importance.

Digitized by Google

In the diocese of S. David's, Mr. Hayward Cox and Mr. Squire were returned avowedly on the principle of opposing a revival, beating two candidates of another way of thinking. Considering that Mr. Cox was so especial a favourite of the late Ministry, as to elicit a flattering letter from the Premier, which went the round of the papers, on the occasion of his presentation to the royal living of Tenby, it seems natural to suppose that Russell churchmanship is popular with the Clergy, as this specimen of it is forthwith returned Proctor of his new diocese. Putting facts together, we should arrive at such a conclusion as this: the country is full of popular elections among the Clergy for Proctors; one diocese elects Mr. Hayward Cox, fresh with the honours of royal patronage, and noted for his liberal views; surely, then, there has been a popular demonstration in favour of Whig ecclesiastical administration. But let us examine the particulars by which this champion of the Whigs finds himself Proctor. In this picturesque diocese, the clergy upon the mountains were not hunted out by the troublesome process of individual citations; nothing but an advertisement in the paper stated when the election was to take place. The consequence of this was, that only seven clerics assembled to record their votes, besides the four candidates, for we give them the benefit of presuming that the candidates were not included in the seven. In this miniature battle, which reminds us, with some distrust of the fitness of our comparison, of the old rotten borough elections, so ruthlessly swept away by the Reform Bill, Mr. Cox and Mr. Squire were arrayed on one side as the opponents of Convocation, while Mr. Bevan and Mr. L. Evans were in its favour. The former obtained four votes, and the latter three,—so great was the triumph of one out of the four cases we refer to. But this is not all. Two votes in their favour were protested against, one on the ground that, as Principal of a training college, one of Mr. Cox's supporters was not eligible, being neither rector, vicar, nor perpetual curate; and, therefore, we would also submit, in advance of our argument, not a parochial clergyman; and the other because he was an archdeacon, and therefore as himself a member of Convocation, not requiring to be represented by a Proctor. Even in this case, therefore, it was not the parochial clergy who returned the unfavourable candidates, and the election may after all be set aside.

We now turn to the two archdeaconries of the diocese of Chichester. It is singular that the diocese, reputed to be more High Church than most, should be so unfortunate as thus to retard the cause of Convocation. With regard to Chichester archdeaconry, however, we may fairly call it a misfortune, and not the real expression of the views of the Clergy. The account

Digitized by Google

of this election is so faithfully recorded in 'The Guardian' by a correspondent, that we give it in the words of that paper:—

'The election for a Proctor to represent the archdeaconry of Chichester took place on Tuesday, August 10, when the Rev. F. Vincent was declared duly elected by a majority of five. It is much to be regretted that in a matter affecting the welfare of the Church private feelings and matters wholly personal should be admitted. Mr. Vincent, though returned by an apparent majority, represents, in fact, the minority of the archdeaconry, his return having been effected by an unfortunate division on grounds exclusively personal in the ranks of his opponents. Mr. Goddard, who had represented the archdeaconry for fifteen years, had ceased to be resident in the diocese, and Mr. Vogan was put forward as a candidate upon the ground that it was fitting that the representative of the archdeaconry should be resident. Mr. Goddard and his friends considered themselves slighted by this, and, although the two candidates represented precisely the same principles, an eager canvass took place. Neither would yield, and though it was soon evident that Mr. Goddard must be in a great minority, his friends were determined to carry the election out at all risks; various plans of accommodation were attempted by the more judicious electors, but without success, and that which both parties must have considered alike—the interests of the Church—was sacrificed to private pique. The result of the election was—Vincent, 35; Vogan, 30; Goddard, 19. Although Mr. Vincent was supported principally by the Low Church party, the principle in question had but little to do with either High or Low Church. With respect to these matters, Mr. Vincent is a moderate man, and in many respects well calculated to represent the archdeaconry; but the principle which was really in question at that time was whether the immediate revival of Convocation was or was not necessary. The three candidates agreeing on other points, differed in this, that Mr. Vogan and Mr. Goddard alike were anxious for the full and free restoration of the Church's synodical action, while Mr. Vincent expressed himself thus:—"For my own part, I do not think that the Church would be a gainer by such a revival of Convocation, and, therefore, though I admit the abstract right or equity, which might be pleaded in its favour, I should be most unwilling, as at present advised, to urge the adoption of such a measure."

'The apparent sentiments of the archdeaconry, therefore, are not its real sentiments; for although the non-restoration candidate was returned by a majority of five, it is evident that had it not been for this most unfortunate and not very creditable squabble, either of the candidates on the opposite side of the question would have come in by a majority of twelve. We trust that the Clergy will see that nothing can injure the cause of Convocation so much as these personalities; for this reason we consider the speech of Mr. Fairles peculiarly reprehensible. From the courtesies which were reciprocated in the speeches of those who might be supposed to represent the high and low schools of divinity in the archdeaconry of Chichester we augur much good. There appears to be little or no animosity between them, and a good deal of mutual respect. This is as it should be, and we are glad to find that the Chancellor noticed it in his concluding speech.'

From this Archdeaconry, the circumstances of which thus speak for themselves, we turn to that of Lewes. In this case we acknowledge a fair contest, as far as we know of its circumstances, and can only regret that a majority of 19 were found to place credit in the *quieta non movere* argument, to use the words of the proposer of Mr. Grace. We do not, however, even

Digitized by Google

here understand that the successful candidate is against Convocation *working;* we rather believe otherwise, though classed in the 'John Bull' as among the few who are unfavourable.

The remaining instance of an election terminating unfavourably, which we proposed to consider, is that of the Archdeaconry of Winchester. The importance of this contest, the great preparations made for it, and the interest excited by it, have made it necessary that we should examine it more in detail than any others. The frequent mention of it also, which has occurred in the public prints, brings before us a considerable number of facts, which throw great light on the cause of so different an issue from what we have seen in nearly all other cases.

The candidates at Winchester were Mr. Haygarth on the non-revival side, and Mr. Trench on the side of Convocation being brought into action. It is unnecessary that we should enlarge on the personal merits and fitness for an office of trust in the Church, which all must attribute to Mr. Trench; and with regard to Mr. Haygarth, we must observe a like silence, because we know nothing about him. The question all along was simply with reference to the part each candidate meant to take, either for or against the revival of Convocation. It is disappointing thus to find, that after a hard contest, Mr. Haygarth obtained ninety-nine votes; and Mr. Trench about fifty. A short history of the affair may, however, explain the reason of this phenomenon.

It is obvious to the most casual observer of the present system of representation, in the matter now before us, that the Proctors of the parochial Clergy are very much overwhelmed by other standing members of Convocation, as Bishops, Archdeacons, Deans, and Chapter Proctors. Surely, therefore, the parochial Clergy have the more claim to keep their small voice unbiassed by a like influence in making their choice of representatives. Individual Clergy may prefer acting under the influence of ecclesiastical dignitaries, and may do so voluntarily; but it is a matter to arouse public jealousy when such a course is adopted on a large scale, and in immediate connexion with the patronage which those dignitaries may possess. A Proctor returned by the influence of patronage, is in the same position as a Member of Parliament who has obtained his seat by bribery. He is not a fair representative of the moral or religious principles of those by whom he is nominally returned. But if the Clergy at large have a right to look with suspicion when they see this kind of influence corrupting the small portion allotted to them in the Houses of Convocation, much more does it become Bishops and Archdeacons, &c., to preserve themselves scrupulously free

Digitized by Google

from liability to any such charge. Feeling how amply, indeed beyond all proportion, they themselves are represented, they ought to be more than content with their exceeding many flocks and herds, without coveting the poor man's one ewe lamb. In the case before us, however, we have to complain that such good taste and right feeling were altogether disregarded, and that corrupt influences, amounting to moral intimidation and bribery, were exerted to an offensive and audacious extent. The Bishop of Winchester, Archdeacon Wigram, and a certain clique of Incumbents, holding great rich livings, given them by the Bishop, would seem to have concocted the whole affair at Farnham Castle, and to have determined on entirely overwhelming any attempt at opposition. One rural deanery, that of Odiham, manfully and judiciously announced Mr. Trench as a candidate, for which they gained great credit, both for their selection and their spirit. But forthwith, this attempt at freedom of opinion was denounced as impertinent and fraught with danger, and a letter was sent to the local paper, which commenced by insulting this one independent rural deanery, and concluded by sounding an alarm that all the laity of the Church would be priest-ridden, if ever Convocation were suffered to meet. Copies of Archdeacon Sinclair's charge against Convocation were circulated round the diocese from Archdeacon Wigram, to mark the line he meant to take, contrary to the general etiquette, which restrains a judge from influencing his court by any privately expressed sentiments of his own. Archdeacon Wigram was about to act the part of returning officer in an election, and any attempt to canvass for a particular interest was an obvious impropriety. Canvassing of all kinds, however, went on under the direction of those whom we have named, and a document also appeared, which, with such illustrative comments as we shall find appropriate, and as the Clergy List supplies, will be interesting both with reference to our immediate object, and also as an abstract curiosity. This document is the manifesto of the Farnham synod; it is the work of his Lordship's faithful and obedient servants, the Clergy of his diocese, who enjoy, or who expect to enjoy, the sweets of Sumner patronage. It is valuable, if we estimate what it cost; and it is profound, if we adopt the principle, which seems to be laid down for the synodical action of our Church, that beneficed Clergy alone can have any voice in it.

It may be well to remember that in the Bishop of Winchester's other Archdeaconry, that of Surrey, a Proctor was returned who was strongly in favour of the revival. From this we may gather that the Bishop's moral influence over the views of his Clergy was not coextensive with his diocese, but was of a partial nature. It happens, however, that not only his moral

Digitized by Google

influence was chiefly manifested in the Archdeaconry of Winchester, but that his livings are for the most part locally situated there, very few, under his patronage, being in the Archdeaconry of Surrey.

Our object in reprinting this circular is to exhibit the overwhelming use made of episcopal patronage, to bear down all opposition to Mr. Haygarth. For this purpose we place it entire before our readers, as sent round the Archdeaconry, and insert within brackets the peculiar *considerations* which, to our mind, may be supposed to have interfered with an impartial exercise of judgment, not only in the persons there named, owing to grateful recollections, but in others also, from certain hopeful anticipations. And even without attributing the smallest perversion of judgment arising from selfish motives, the simple fact, that all but two of the whole number have been given to these Incumbents by the present Bishop, plainly exhibits one kind of religious sentiment to have been injected, out of common proportion, into the Archdeaconry, which being kept together by constant encouragement, makes it an exception to the average of parochial clergy. The total number of signatures to this paper, as we have it before us, is seventy-eight, and out of that we shall affix, in brackets, some mark of episcopal influence, direct or indirect, to upwards of forty. It must also be remembered that beside the more solid tokens of episcopal favour, represented by livings, all Rural Deaneries are nominated by the Bishop as a certain mark of esteem. With these comments, therefore, the paper shall tell its own tale.

'We, the undersigned Beneficed Clergy, in the Archdeaconry of Winchester, do hereby declare:—

'That, while we recognise the Right of Convocation to apply to the Queen for licence to deliberate, we consider it inexpedient, under present circumstances, that such application should be made.

'That, in the election of a Proctor to represent the Clergy of this Archdeaconry in the ensuing Convocation, we are prepared to give our confidence to one who, whilst possessing the requisite qualifications for the office, concurs with us in the above opinion.

'That, for these reasons, we consider the Rev. John Haygarth, Rector of Upham, and Rural Dean, a suitable person to represent the Clergy of this Archdeaconry.

'Richard Baker, Rector of Botley.
Samuel Best, Rector of Abbot's Ann.
Alfred Bishop, Rector of Martyr Worthy. [In Bishop's gift, 343*l.*]
Frederick C. Blackstone, Vicar of Heckfield, and Rural Dean.
William M. K. Bradford, Rector of Westmeon, and Rural Dean. [In Bishop's gift, 600*l.*]
William Bridges, Incumbent of St. Peter's Church, Lyss.
William Brock, Rector of Bishop's Waltham. [In Bishop's gift, 915*l.*]
J. B. Burnett, Rector of Houghton. [In Bishop's gift, 438*l.*]
William F. Burrows, Vicar of Christchurch. [In gift of Dean and Chapter of Winchester: the Chapter appointed by Bishop, 164*l.*]

Digitized by Google

Henry Carey, Perpetual Curate of Aldershott.
William Carus, Vicar of Romsey, Canon of Winchester, and Rural Dean. [Canonry in Bishop's gift, worth 760*l.*, Romsey Dean and Canon.]
Thomas Clarke, Vicar of Mitcheldever, and Rural Dean.
T. Clarke, jun., Incumbent of Woodmancott.
John Noble Coleman, Incumbent of S. Katherine's Church, Ventnor, I.W.
Adair Colpoys, Rector of Droxford. [In Bishop's gift, 744*l.*]
Thomas Cottle, Vicar of Shalfleet.
E. B. Creek, Incumbent of Swanmore. [In Bishop's gift, 125*l.*]
Anthony Crowdy, Rector of Winnall. [In Bishop's gift, 170*l.*]
Alexander R. C. Dallas, Rector of Wonston. [In Bishop's gift, 967*l.*]
R. Denny, Perpetual Curate of Shidfield. [In Bishop's gift, 100*l.*]
William M. Dudley, Vicar of Whitchurch, and Rector of Laverstoke. [Whitchurch in Bishop's gift, 205*l.*]
William Stevens Dusautoy, Rector of Exton. [In Bishop's gift, 331*l.*]
Charles S. Fanshawe, Rector of All Saints, Southampton.
Gerald S. Fitzgerald, Incumbent of Christchurch, Portswood. [In gift of Rector of S. Mary's, Southampton, which Rectory is in Bishop's gift.]
Edward Frowd, Rector of Upper Clatford.
Maximilian Geneste, Incumbent of the Church of the Holy Trinity, West Cowes.
William Gibson, Rector of Fawley, and Rural Dean. [In Bishop's gift, 1,179*l.*]
Francis Osborne Gifford, Vicar of Hartley Wintney.
W. D. Harrison, Vicar of South Stoneham. [In the gift of Rector of S. Mary's, Southampton, which Rectory is in gift of Bishop, Stoneham, 500*l.*]
Thomas Goodwin Hatchard, Rector of Havant. [In Bishop's gift, 489*l.*]
James Williams Hatherell, Incumbent of St. James's, Westend. [Virtually in Bishop's gift, 150*l.*, as Christchurch and Stoneham.]
William V. Hennah, Incumbent of East Cowes.
W. N. Hooper, Minor Canon, and Precentor of Winchester Cathedral, and Incumbent of Littleton. [Littleton, Dean and Chapter, Winchester, therefore under Bishop.]
Henry Howell, Incumbent of S. Peter's, Curdridge. [In gift of Rector of B. Waltham, appointed by Bishop.]
F. H. Hutton, Vicar of Leckford.
Charles Jackson, Perpetual Curate of Bentley. [In gift of Archdeacon of Surrey, approved by Bishop, 106*l.*]
Philip Jacob, Rector of Crawley, Canon of Winchester, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, Crawley, 690*l.*; Canonry, 760*l.*; Bishop's Examining Chaplain.]
W. Jones, Rector of Morestead. [In gift of Bishop, 180*l.*]
T. C. Kemp, Vicar of Eastmeon. [In gift of Bishop, 903*l.*]
Anthony L. Lambert, Rector of Chilbolton, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, 430*l.*]
John Law, Rector of Elvetham.
E. McAll, Rector of Brighstone, and Rural Dean. [In gift of Bishop, 515*l.*]
T. M. Macdonogh, Incumbent of Bransgore.
Wyndham C. Madden, Vicar of Fareham. [In gift of Bishop, 530*l.*]
Samuel Maddock, Vicar of Bishop Sutton.
John Pierce Maurice, Rector of Michelmersh. [In gift of Bishop, 671*l.*]
John Powlett McGhie, Vicar of Portsmouth, and Rural Dean.
Frederick Græme Middleton, Perpetual Curate of Medsted. [In gift of Bishop, 580*l.*]

Digitized by Google

N. Midwinter, Rector of S. Michael's, Winchester. [In gift of Bishop, 104*l.*]
W. Norris, Rector of Warblington, and Rural Dean.
W. Orger, Incumbent of Shirley.
W. H. Parker, Perpetual Curate of Barton S. Paul's, Whippingham, I.W.
Charles Richard Pettat, Rector of Ashe, and of Deane.
William J. G. Phillips, Vicar of Eling, and Rector of Millbrook. [Millbrook in gift of Bishop, 487*l.*]
Henry A. Plow, Rector of Ovington. [In gift of Bishop, 219*l.*]
Thomas Robinson, Vicar of Milford.
J. Aubrey Scott, Rector of West Tytherly.
Henry W. Sheppard, Incumbent of S. James' and S. Peter's, Emsworth.
J. De Lasaux Simmonds, Rector of Chilcomb. [In gift of Bishop, 167*l.*]
Thomas Snow, Vicar of Newton Valence.
Paulet S. John, Rector of Mottisfont.
A. H. Stogdon, Incumbent of S. John's, Portsea.
J. M. Sumner, Rector of Buriton with Petersfield. [In gift of Bishop, 1,194*l.*]
George Sumner, Rector of Old Alresford. [In gift of Bishop, 556*l.*]
James Tanner, Incumbent of S. Matthew's, Gosport. [In gift of Bishop, 150*l.*]
William Thomas, Incumbent of Christchurch, Sandown, Isle of Wight.
Francis Tyrrell, Perpetual Curate of Milton.
Henry Usborne, Incumbent of Bitterne, Southampton.
G. S. Utterton, Rector of Calbourne, Isle of Wight. [In gift of Bishop, 464*l.*]
Edward Langton Ward, Rector of Blendworth.
Thomas Alston Warren, Rector of South Warnborough.
Henry G. Wells, Rector of Kingsworthy, and Rural Dean.
W. Wilson, Canon of Winchester, and Vicar of Holy Rhood, Southampton. [Canonry in gift of Bishop, 760*l.*]
D. Williams, Rector of Baughurst. [In gift of Bishop, 188*l.*]
William Williams, Vicar of S. Bartholomew, Hyde.
Walter B. Wither, Rector of Wootton. [Dean and Chapter, therefore under Bishop.]
Thomas Woodrooffe, Rector of S. Maurice, and Canon of Winchester. [S. Maurice, 145*l.* in gift of Bishop; Canonry, 760*l.*]
I. O. Zillwood, Rector of Compton. [In gift of Bishop, 329*l.*]'

The sum total of all the patronage thus unblushingly exercised to influence the free action of Convocation, we have reckoned to be somewhat more than £18,000 a-year; a sum well calculated in all positions of life to do a great deal of work. We do not mean that, because a clergyman has a Bishop's living, he ought not to take an active part in Church affairs; but we simply point to this election as a whole, and deprecate most strongly what has been an overbearing and intimidating line of conduct, managed by the enormous influence which patronage, to the amount we have stated, must always give to a Bishop living in the midst of it himself, and in constant communication with the favoured objects of his power. What would have been said if the Bishop of Exeter had led forth the same band of adherents to fight his battles for the Church? and, indeed, it must have

Digitized by Google

been a melancholy sight to witness the imbecility of mind and body which was gathered together at Winchester, that it might quash, if possible, the young and vigorous action by which the Church is striving to meet the demands laid upon it. Old clergymen, who had not made their appearance in public for a long time, or who were even so infirm that they were unable to attend the services of the Church when at home, were dragged up to perform this sad and ungracious task of endeavouring to perpetuate a state of helplessness and indolence in the Church, of which they themselves had been, in many cases, too prominent examples. Several who saw all this refused to vote at all, having come for Mr. Haygarth. Yet, in spite of all influence from patronage, and in spite, also, of the systematic control exercised over the Rural Deans, and the abuse poured upon an unhappy individual of them who may express an independent opinion, and in spite of the risk incurred by many of forfeiting the hospitality and general good graces of Farnham Castle, we are glad to have it in our power to congratulate the Archdeaconry, that so many free and independent votes were recorded in favour of Mr. Trench.

Having now reviewed the elections individually, so far at least as is essential to our present purpose, we would invite attention to some general motives, which would seem of late to have guided the minds of the parochial clergy and influenced their votes. The question of High and Low Church has been much brought in, the former as being in favour of the Church's synodical action, and the latter against it. On the whole this has been the real state of the case; but there are many exceptions. Some honest and sincere members of the Low Church party have expressed their willingness to appeal to Convocation as the popular voice of the Church, and therefore as a fit tribunal before which certain differences should be settled; but generally speaking, that party betray the greatest dislike at anything like a fair representative system in the Church. The most energetic motive, however, of the present revival, springs from a wider basis than any one of the many party questions which have been agitating our Church. It is the natural love of harmony and concord, which seeks for some powerful centre on which confidence can be bestowed. The very agitation which has lately been witnessed in the election of Proctors, instead of aggravating the divisions of the Church, has brought together many smaller shades of opinion to act in concert, which of late have been painfully and unnecessarily estranged from each other. It is altogether a false argument, which so many adopt, that Convocation will create party spirit of a more dangerous character than exists where there is no power of self-regulation. It is the smaller suspicions

Digitized by Google

which exist between one and another, when all are without government, that are more wholly destructive of any useful concord and cooperation in practical things, than are the greater divisions, which by their mutual balance are the natural stimulus of a representative system. The parochial clergy, when Convocation meets and acts, will discuss the questions of the day as external to their own private responsibilities, and therefore in a manner which will not provoke nearly the same amount of bitterness, as when every question seems to be argued for each man by himself in person. It is very plausible for men in public life to say, that there will be grievous divisions of the Church exposed to the world, if Convocation acts. They see at present a sort of picture of quiet clergymen working their parishes undisturbed, to the distant eye, by the *odium theologicum* of religious debate; but a closer inspection of the actual state of the Clergy at this present time, betrays a far more dangerous want of good feeling and of any right understanding of their common cause, a far more practical inability to unite in good works for the glory of God and the good of the Church, than could ever be occasioned by the most exciting debates among their legally authorized representatives assembled in Synod. What is felt to be the great evil now, is in the almost individual isolation of every clergyman, who is left unaided to judge about practical or doctrinal questions. The discussion of such affairs with other clergymen has, when attempted, so often led to unpleasant personal feelings, that a truce is mutually proclaimed, by which the intercourse of social life is tacitly allowed to drag on a sort of deadened existence, unrefreshed by the expression of mutual thoughts on those subjects which are most in the thoughts of all. This kind of dismemberment is more insidious and more dangerous to the ultimate purposes of the Church, than any fair and legitimate discussion between two great parties, such as, if carried on in Convocation, would unite under their respective banners many smaller differences, and afford an open field of discussion to the Clergy generally, not so closely allied to individual responsibilities as to create mutual suspicions. Yet to an external eye, such as we must call even many of our Bishops', the one course seems that of peace and quietness, the other that of disorder and tumult.

But why should Convocation, even if we grant that there will be opposite factions in it, which will carry on eager debates, be so necessarily and exclusively the scene of angry feelings? Why are Clergy, selected for the work by the united judgment of their brethren, to be condemned as unfit for fair and open deliberation? Clergy are in general well educated men, with more than common responsibility to conduct themselves in an orderly man-

Digitized by Google

ner; they are accustomed to take a prominent position in all public affairs, and are not found behind others in the power of judging about disputed questions, as, for instance, when called on to act as magistrates; and why therefore are they to be set down as so utterly unqualified for public deliberation about religion, as that it is far better to leave all such things even in the hands of that promiscuous body of many and no religions, the House of Commons?

To return, however, to the point we were discussing, viz. the general feeling among the Clergy in favour of some power whereon to place confidence, and to which they may look for the fair discussion and decision of matters that are of interest to them. It may be asked by some few, Why not trust to the good sense and justice of the civil power, with the Queen as head of the Church, with the Bishops in the House of Lords, with the presumed acknowledgment of the Christian religion, still binding on the House of Commons, and with all the courts of law, to legislate and arbitrate in all ecclesiastical matters? This may be asked: but it will be answered, that this is an imposing array of governing powers, but unfortunately, the parties most concerned are singularly cut off from any voice in the government of themselves. The direction of the Church by the secular arm has been tried, and found very incapable of regulating the affairs of an active religious body. The politicians of the last half-century have taught the Clergy a lesson, which they wish seriously and practically to turn to good account.

It may again be asked, Are not the Bishops in their dioceses the links of union and the arbiters of disputed points, which should keep the Clergy in an efficient state of activity and co-operation? Unfortunately it is felt that they are not equal to this task: that individually or collectively there is a weakness and want of resolute purpose, accompanied often with an ungracious irritability, that is the unconscious substitute for the power of equal justice and quiet strength. The Bishops are unnaturally situated at present, in being without that systematic union of the different orders of Clergy which synodical action is meant to supply. There is, in fact, an unhappy jealousy of Bishops among the Clergy, which is not altogether the fault of either party, but of the system of relationship which exists between them. Episcopal power now is alternately feared for its arbitrary nature, and ridiculed for its helpless incapacity. It can appear in sudden bursts of indignant power against one cause of irritation, and against another, when all the Bench are summoned to a conclave at the Bounty Office, they can bring forth what is only a confession of weakness.

But without entering further into this question, we have stated sufficient grounds to prove, in a general manner, that a

certain jealousy of episcopal and civil power over the Church, with some dearly-bought experience of the confusion arising from their recent exercise, have all conduced to make the Clergy desirous of claiming their constitutional rights in ecclesiastical Synod. It is in vain now for the Bishops to talk to the Clergy of the disturbance of peace attending such a mode of action; indeed, if Bishops would consult their reputation for good taste, they will now see that language of that kind is to be avoided, because it is obviously but a shallow argument to defend their own side of a very large open question, which remains to be settled between themselves and their clergy. They are not impartial judges, for the whole movement has much to do with a conviction among the Clergy that they do not stand in a fair position toward their Bishops, or rather, to take away all idea of personal dissatisfaction, that the mutual relations between the government of the Church and the parochial clergy are not such as to promote, as far as may be, the working energies and the spiritual good of the Church.

Facts seem now to prove the mistaken policy of all such dignitaries as have taken an active part against the movement. They may be sure that there will be great jealousy aroused among the parochial clergy, when they hear those ecclesiastics who are in office and power themselves, taking the invidious line, of denying a fair and representative influence to the rest of the Clergy. The Archdeacon of Middlesex thought fit to deliver a Charge against the active revival of Convocation; but what was the effect of it upon the Clergy? When the election came they appointed two men, who were both for the revival, to be submitted to the Bishop's selection. The same course was adopted by the Bishop of Norwich, who, though acknowledging, in his recent Charge, that the counsels of the parochial clergy were needed by the Bishop, and again, that the Church required some mode of adapting its services to the wants of the people, yet arrived at no practical conclusion, but what was evidently the burden of his song, viz. that Diocesan Synods and Convocation were, must be, and should be utterly extinct, and, therefore, that the Clergy need not think any more about them. What, however, was the response which the Bishop himself had the opportunity of witnessing from his Clergy, but a very week after? Sitting in his court, for the purpose of returning the Proctor for Convocation whom his Clergy should select, he saw before him some 150 of them, who, without any other candidate being proposed, elected a man pledged before the whole assembly, as determined to make his office a real and active one, if he were chosen to be Proctor.

With one brief glance at the future, we must now conclude our remarks. When the time comes, the Jerusalem Chamber

will assume a very different aspect from what has been the case for the last century on similar occasions. There will be assembled in it churchmen whose names are well known, as active and zealous supporters of Convocation. Having been selected by their brother clergy for a certain work, they will be determined by all legitimate means to accomplish their end. They will bring with them the almost unanimous voice of the parochial clergy in their cause, and they will also, on their own parts, bring talent, station, influence, and a resolute will. There will be men, calculated by nature for rough work, if needful, yet bound by their office, and pledged by the respect of their friends, to prefer a peaceful course. There will be fluent orators, ready debaters, prepared to exert their natural powers, then and there, and also prepared to claim their rights, and boldly state the grievances of the Clergy in other ways, if an attempt is made to check the element of our constitution on which they are acting. We cannot foresee the exact course which will be adopted either by the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Queen's advisers, but we sincerely trust, that, after examining the justice and equity of the case before them, there will be no arbitrary or summary mode attempted, from either of these quarters, for the purpose of resisting so loud an appeal from the whole mass of those clergy who, scattered about the country, are doing the real work of the Church. Nor, again, let the Bishops, by a majority of the Upper House, take upon themselves the responsibility of refusing to sanction the necessary address to the Crown for the royal licence to debate. On grounds which we have already suggested, this would be an odious proceeding, which we should be sorry to describe according to its merits, until it has been done. But, however the first effort of this present Convocation may end, our conviction, expressed at first, remains the same, that we are warranted in stating Convocation to be already an active power. The body of Proctors now elected, are, in many ways, a *power*, which, with the constitutional sanction they possess, must tell upon all the affairs of Church management, and which can obstruct all other legislation for the Church, until their just claims are conceded.

One caution, also, we would suggest to the advocates of Convocation, in case they really find themselves in active debate. The line we have adopted throughout the whole question has been, to treat of Convocation as an old, not a new thing; to claim it as a legal right, to develop its position by legal facts, and to establish our hold on synodical action generally, by keeping a tight grasp on the details of that form, by which it has so long been preserved in a dormant state among us, till the time should come when a period of activity will follow sleep. In accordance with this view, we should advise that the present

legal status of Convocation should be thoroughly established, and in an active state, before any sweeping reforms are attempted. By premature reforms on too large a scale, the whole legal basis of the question may be so confused, so many openings may be given for drawing general disapprobation on parts of the present system, that our enemies may be able to invade the strength of our original foundation, while we are disputing as to what changes there should be in the superstructure. Let the Church keep what she has got and hold it fast, before we make such questions, as the admission of the laity, any very prominent part of the subject. There are, of course, many points which call for reform. The separation of the Provinces is one, and also the inadequate representation of the parochial clergy. But to discuss these is not within our present design. If we look, however, to the history of Europe and America during the last hundred years, we shall see that among numerous attempts at reform, none have been durable, except those that proceeded gradually. Let the reformers, therefore, of Convocation be content to amend it bit by bit, and step by step, not adopting some complete theoretical scheme all at once.

In a question of public interest like that which we have been discussing, in which the newspapers of the day are the objects of review, it may be of use to put on record not only the line adopted by those papers who are favourable to ourselves, but also the line taken by that exponent of a certain phase of the popular mind, justly called 'The Times.' A knowledge of the coarse and ignorant ground taken by this journal may throw light on the justice, the expediency, and even the necessity of the Church in making present claim for the revival of Convocation. We thus conclude by inserting an article from 'The Times' of August 5, with an answer to it from 'The Guardian' of August 11:—

'The serious business of a contested election has been succeeded by a ludicrous and meaningless imitation of its forms. After having elected the Parliament which is to do business and make laws, we proceed, in deference to time-honoured custom, to elect those who are to do nothing at all. It is now 135 years since the Convocation of the Clergy met together for the despatch of business, which consisted on that occasion of a furious onslaught on the character and writings of Bishop HOADLEY. By the Act of Submission passed in the reign of Henry VIII. the Clergy in Convocation assembled are forbidden to enter upon any business without the Royal licence, and yet by a tenacious adherence to old forms, the spirit of which has utterly departed, the Clergy are periodically summoned to meet and choose representatives to compose a body which it is well known will be prorogued as soon as it meets, and dissolved without entering upon business. Any other nation but ourselves would by this time have found out some means of better reconciling practice and theory, and, if Convocation was not to meet, would have found out some means of getting rid of the election of a body which was destined to prove utterly helpless and useless.

Not so, however, the practical English nation. The intolerable evil lay not in the election, but in the deliberations and quarrels of Convocation, and if these be stopt the election is believed to be a harmless formality. We have no objection to the Clergy loading the blunderbuss as often as they please, provided we are sure it is in our power to prevent them from letting it off. In this, however, we may have somewhat miscalculated. It is better that those who are not intended to use fire-arms should not constantly be in the habit of seeing and handling them, and if we are resolved that the Clergy shall not meet in Convocation, it were better to relieve them from the trouble of an ineffective election, which only serves to remind them of duties they are not destined to perform. We are too busy and too practical a people to indulge in idle ceremonies. There is work to be done in all directions, and when we have been at the trouble of constructing a body, it naturally recalcitrates against the sentence of compulsory idleness. For these reasons it would seem that our present course is indefensible on any principle. If Convocation be elected it ought to be suffered to meet, and if it is never to meet it ought on every reasonable principle never to be elected. The present practice is in either view really indefensible.

'There are not, however, wanting reasons which supersede the necessity of arguing the matter in the alternative, and which seem to show pretty conclusively, if not to the Clergy, at least to the laity, that Convocation ought never to meet again. It is argued—and plausibly argued—that in proportion as the assistance of the State is withdrawn from the Church of England, it ought to seek an indemnification of its losses in greater internal efficacy and more complete organization. It is said that the Church should seek from within that support which is not conceded her from without, and that if she be placed more nearly on a level with dissenters, she ought to be allowed a freedom of action and power of self-government, such as their separation from the State enables them to enjoy. Enthusiastic men sigh for the vigour and self-regulating power of the voluntary system, and believe that these advantages are consistent with the retention of the temporal advantages and preeminent political position of the Church of England.

'We have endeavoured to state these arguments fairly, and we believe they admit of a ready and conclusive answer. All religious bodies which have been able efficiently to organize themselves do this by virtue of the unity of their belief. They not merely call themselves by the same name, but they hold the same creed and profess the same doctrines. As long as the infinite varieties of human judgment occasion a decided difference of opinion a schism takes place, the advocates of a new doctrine separate from those of the old, a fresh unit is formed, and a new society, regularly graduated and articulated, and carrying within itself the same germ of present self-government and future division, is formed. In these bodies compromise is unknown; unity of opinion is the condition of their existence; and they rather weaken themselves by eternal subdivision than admit the possibility of allowing discordant opinions to grow up side by side in the same sect.

'How different is the case of the Church of England! Moulded into her present shape—not by her own internal energy acting from within, but by Parliament pressing on her from without—she possesses every attribute, every advantage, and every disadvantage of a compromise. Her Articles and authorized formularies are so drawn as to admit within her pale persons differing as widely as it is possible for the professors of the Christian religion to differ from each other. The object was evidently not to give predominance to any particular set of opinions, but to include as large a number of persons as the then feelings of the nation would permit within the precincts of the Church. Unity was neither sought nor obtained, but comprehension was aimed at and accomplished. Therefore we have within

the pale of the Church of England persons differing not merely in their particular tenets, but in the rule and ground of their belief, the one party seeking religion in the Bible with the help of the Spirit, the other in the Church by the means of tradition. This being the true state of the case, what would be gained by calling together an assembly in which these irreconcilable differences would meet each other face to face? Is there any one who seriously thinks that the basis on which the Church of England is constructed is too wide and comprehensive, and that we have anything to gain, either in point of permanence or of justice, in narrowing down her temporal privileges and immunities to a smaller portion of her Majesty's subjects than at present—in increasing the number of dissenters, and, therefore, of persons inimical to any establishment whatever? Or do they suppose that the effect of bringing Low and High Church into contact on the benches of Convocation will be that the one will convince the other, and a difference directly referable to principles as indestructible as the human mind itself, be abolished by argument or be overpowered by clamour? If none of these things are possible, what result can we expect, except that differences will be embittered and magnified by argument and juxtaposition, and a compromise always more defensible in practice than in theory, and rather commendable for its good fruits than for its speculative and logical perfection, be cast to the winds? The same power of freely meeting and deliberating, of discussing and altering, which is essential to the existence of a voluntary church, is destructive to a compromise entered into and carried out under the sanction and by the authority of the State. It is the nature of a compromise, not that people should agree in opinion, but agree to avoid the discussion of points on which they differ. Thus, in America, North and South cannot agree on the slave question, and so they agree not to discuss it at all. To violate this understanding would be fatal to the Union, and to discuss the discordant creeds included within the Church of England would be to destroy the Church. Let those who are pressing on towards this consummation reflect that when, by the indulgence of the restless spirit of innovation, they have destroyed our present Church Establishment, it will be impossible for them, considering the temper of men's minds, and the direction in which the current of men's ideas is setting, ever to reconstruct another equally effective and equally comprehensive.'

Such is the view taken by 'The Times,' to which 'The Guardian' ably answers in the following article:—

'Among the many conveniences which are furnished to the world by "The Times" newspaper, there is one which is not so much felt as it deserves to be. It supplies a means of joining issue with public opinion. The office of that newspaper is to divine and represent with ability what are, or in the course of a month or two are likely to be, the opinions of that undefinable part of the English nation which goes by the name of the "public"—a curious and formidable compound of shallowness with shrewdness—justice with prejudice—public spirit with selfishness—conceit with good sense—and generosity with vulgar tyranny. "The Times" gives a tangible and reasonable shape to the feelings and ideas which actuate this huge floating mass, and thus, while it gives them, so far as the case admits of it, the force arising from clearness and coherency, affords an opportunity for direct attack which they would not offer while they were merely unrecognised sentiments, infecting the whole body, but distinctly stated only by a few obscure writers, not claiming to represent any but themselves or their comparatively small party.

'Now, "The Times" has taken up the subject of Convocation, and has distinctly adopted a line of argument which indistinctly actuates more, perhaps, than any other the mass of half thinkers, who have a large share

in governing this country, and who, so far as they care about the matter, would resist any approach to free action on the part of the Church. It contrasts with most convenient sharpness with the argument which Churchmen use on the other side.

'The Church of England, it is said, on the one hand is a religious body, founded on a certain religious belief. It must have an organic and constitutional mode of expressing that belief. In theory, Convocation is such a mode, and circumstances now force upon us the necessity of reducing that theory to practice. The Church of England, replies "The Times,"—for this is the real substance of the answer—is *not* a religious body; she has *no* religious opinions of her own, therefore she does not need a voice to express any. To give her such a voice would be merely to furnish her members with an opportunity of wrangling on a large scale, certain to be used while men are what they are, but wholly destructive to the very law of her existence.

'We shall not attempt to argue this question, but shall merely place the two views in contrast.

'Churchmen consider that the Bible, whether interpreted by individuals, by the early ages, or by the existing Church, contains an immense mass of truth of which part is distinct, part indistinct; part, in theological phrase, "necessary to salvation,"—an integral portion of that Christian truth by the knowledge of which the human soul is trained for eternal life, part not thus necessary. Real and professed Churches have differed to the utmost extent as what is distinct and what indistinct, what material, and what comparatively immaterial, but on the principle all are agreed. All unite in admitting that a line must be drawn somewhere. No body of Christians would allow Mahometanism to be taught in their churches as the religion of the Bible—none would compel all their members to believe precisely alike on the nature of the heavenly joys. But till now it has been considered that, whatever questions might be left open, a certain amount of religious belief was necessary to the existence of a religious body; that the Church of England was such a body, and that her very definite belief was to be found in her Prayer-Book and Articles, which exclude from her body, not only Roman Catholics (though this alone would be sufficient for our argument), but whole masses of so-called heretics, too numerous to be counted by any but a theologian. And we may perhaps remark, in passing, that till within the last ten or twelve years the popular charge against the Church of England has been, not that her formularies and practice were too lax in this respect, but that they were intolerably rigid, and she herself jealous and intolerant in her enforcement of them. And finally, this dogmatism of hers has been distinctly accepted by the State, which *inter alia* has retained to the present day for its Sovereign the title of Defender of *the Faith*.

'The fact that the Church of England has spoken ambiguously on some points, be they ever so important, does not in any degree interfere with, or modify the fact that she has spoken with all the clearness of which language is capable on others, and those others constitute her religious belief. Whether her definitions are too many or too few, there they are, shaped by her divines, adopted by her ecclesiastical authorities, recognised and enforced by the laws of her country, and forming a basis on which is built a superstructure, comprising some 15,000 Clergy and the laity in communion with them. Whatever differences may exist within that body, no reasonable man can pretend to believe that if Unitarianism were proclaimed to-morrow as the national religion, that body would either cease to exist or become Socinian. In such an event the Church would at once lose all that she holds as organ of the State; she would, in all probability, be speedily robbed

Digitized by Google

of what she possesses as her own, and a considerable number of her members would follow the emoluments. Further consequences would follow, on which it would be trifling to speculate, since they are among those which the Almighty directs in ways and for reasons which are most peculiarly His own, and which are proportionably inscrutable to us His creatures. But, humanly speaking—and it is possible to speak humanly on such a subject—it cannot be doubted that the old religious body would survive, and would be recognised by all the world as surviving on the basis of that religious truth with which it had previously been identified.

'Now, what says "The Times?" "All religious bodies which have been able efficiently to organize themselves do this by virtue of the unity of their belief. They do not merely call themselves by the same name; but they hold the same creed and profess the same doctrine." True. So far we are agreed. A creed is necessary to an organized religious body. And such we say is the Church of England. But not so proceeds "The Times:"—

'"How different is the case of the Church of England! Moulded into her present shape—not by her own internal energy acting from within, but by Parliament pressing on her from without—she possesses every attribute, every advantage, and every disadvantage of a compromise. Her Articles and authorized formularies are so drawn as to admit within her pale persons differing as widely as it is possible for the professors of the Christian religion to differ from each other. The object was evidently not to give predominance to any particular set of opinions, but to include as large a number of persons as the then feelings of the nation would permit within the precincts of the Church."

'According to this view, to say that the English Church is not a religious body is even less than the truth. It might almost be called anti-religious; it does not even represent, but is framed in order to stifle and delude the religious feeling of the nation. The object was "to include as large a number of persons as the then feelings of the nation would permit within the precincts of the Church," or in other words, to exclude from the creed every doctrine which the nation with its then feelings did not insist upon retaining. What exists in the Church of religious belief was forced upon it from without, contrary to its own policy and intention. And it is on behalf of this policy that "The Times" affects to protest—affects, we say, because we find an insuperable difficulty in believing that any clever person (which the writer evidently is) could advance such an argument unless he desired the destruction either of religion in general or of the Church of England in particular. We can imagine a conscious infidel endeavouring by such a course of argument to habituate the popular mind to the idea of a creedless establishment as a sure, though indirect, mode of depriving it of any Christian belief. We can imagine a Roman Catholic overacting the part of a Liberal in his anxiety to urge against the English Church his favourite reproach of Parliamentarianism. We could imagine a German sentimentalist (though not a writer in the English "Times") imagining the possibility of fraternising in some so-called religious appreciation of some indefinite infinite apart from any distinct belief of any actual supernatural truth. But we cannot imagine a man seriously—though ever so coldly—believing in anything that deserves to be called Christianity, and seriously arguing for the maintenance of the *status quo* of the English Church on the ground that she does not lay down religious truth on any point "on which it is possible for the professors of the Christian religion to differ from each other,"—that she has no religious creed, and consequently is not a religious body, but some indescribable and inconceivable entity, a function of Government, an exponent of opinion, a financial arrangement or a compromise.'

Digitized by Google

ART. IV.—*The Monthly Packet of Evening Readings*, 1852; *A Garland for the Year.*

IT would be an inquiry, equally curious and profitable, which should investigate that which we may call the domestic influence of the Mediæval Church. How ecclesiastical festivals became seasons of home enjoyment; how holy days were turned into holidays; how the Church's children learnt, in private life, to think and to speak in the Church's way; how, ascending higher, the powers of this world, the governors of the state, fell almost unconsciously into the times and the seasons of her who is not of this world; how, for example, sheriffs were pricked on the morrow of S. Martin; how lawyers reckoned by Hilary or Trinity term; how every class was subject to the same moulding influence; how boys went a *Midlenting*, and peasants hunted the wren on S. Stephen's day, and kings held their Maundy. Merchants, over their ledgers, spoke the language, at least, of religion; till very lately, bills of lading always commenced with the words, '*I*, A. B. *do send greeting in the Lord God everlasting;*' nor are the formulæ quite obsolete, 'The ship C. whereof D. E. *under God* is master;' nor yet that, 'To sail with the first fair wind *that God shall send.*' Gems were invested with a thousand mystical significations in the eyes of the jeweller; the country simpler had his Lent Lilies, his Herb Trinity, his Our Lord and Lady, his Alleluia Flower, his Star of Bethlehem.[1] Children began their Alphabet with a *Crisoross;* countrymen saw in the ass the token of our Lord's entry into Jerusalem; suicides were buried in a cross way. It was the same influence always and everywhere at work; sometimes beautifully, sometimes amusingly, sometimes extravagantly, but always most really. The Church, whatever her language, was herself vernacular.

We propose to give a few of the national and provincial terms which have been impressed on Ecclesiastical Holydays. It

[1] The Church names of flowers are most ably given in the series of papers which stands at the head of this Article. We know not where we have read a series combining so much of ecclesiastical research, with such a sense of the picturesque, and so much love for English landscape; in fact, every way so perfectly delightful. We recommend it very strongly to our readers, and we trust that the labours of the Author (or perhaps Authoress), will be extended to other parts of nature, when the present set shall conclude with the year. Birds and insects would afford a large scope. To give an instance from the latter:—The Lady-bird, or Lady-cow, (of course called from Our Lady,) is in Spanish the *Vaquilla de Dios* (God's little Cow); in German, the May-Lady; in French, the *Bête à bon Dieu;* in Russ, *Boja Korovka* (God's Cow).

Digitized by Google

may not be entirely useless to dwell on them; for we are not yet perfectly rid of that stiffness which led men, at the beginning of the movement, to call Christmas Eve the Vigil of the Nativity, and to date letters on the Monday of Pentecost. That a Church should really be national, her terms must be household words, as they have always most been when a national Church was most efficient. Without further preface, we will begin with the commencement of the Ecclesiastical year.

It is curious that the season of Advent should have retained its Latin name everywhere. The Sundays, indeed, were not always reckoned in the same way, the more usual method being to count the first as the fourth, and that nearest to Christmas as the first. The old rule for finding the first Sunday in Advent ran thus:—

> Saint Andrew the King
> Three weeks and three days before Christmas comes in:
> Three days after, or three days before,
> Advent Sunday knocks at the door.

The old Hispanic Advent had six weeks, the Sunday next after Martinmas being the first;[1] and this is also the case in the Ambrosian rite.

Church saws fixed the commencement of winter to S. Clement's Day. The usual lines which regulate the beginning of the Seasons are:—

> Dat Clemens hyemem; dat Petri ver Cathedratus:
> Æstuat Urbanus: autumnat Symphorianus.

We have read them thus in a Cambray Missal:—

> Cedit hyems retro cathedrato Simone Petro.
> Ver fugat Urbanus; æstatem Symphorianus.
> Festum Clementis caput est hyemis venientis.

Or, if the reader wishes a version:—

> Winter goes off, and skies grow fair,
> When Simon Peter sits in Chair:
> Saint Urban bids the Spring be gone:
> Symphorian calls the autumn on:
> Saint Clement's day the wind and rain
> And cold of winter brings again.

And a very fair division too, if we add to the times specified, (February 22, May 25, August 22, and November 21,) the eight or ten days that the correction of the Calendar, at the date when these verses were written, would have required.

---

[1] When the Dominical letter is A, there are, in fact, seven Sundays in the Mozarabic Advent. But in that case the seventh falls on Christmas Eve, and the office is of that day entirely.

Digitized by Google

The season of Advent has left few traces in natural names. *Advent-grass* hence receives its title; and in Germany wild geese are called *Advent-birds*, and sometimes, as also with us, *Ember-geese*.

The English Calendar gives the old rule for the discovery of the Advent Ember-days; the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, after S. Lucy's Day.

> Fasting days and Emberings be
> Lent, Whitsun, Holyrood, and Lucie;

said the rhyme. The modern Roman use fixes them to the third week in Advent, which must always come to the same thing.

The cristate verses give three of the four:—

> Dant Crux, Lucia, Cineres, charismata dia,
> Ut sit in angariâ quarta sequens feria.

The Latin name has remained in modern languages, though the contrary is sometimes affirmed, *Quatuor Tempora*, the *Four Times*. In French and Italian the term is the same; in Spanish and Portuguese they are simply *Temporas*. The German converts them into *Quatember*, and thence, by the easy corruption of dropping the first syllable, a corruption which also takes place in some German dialects, we get the English *Ember*. Thus, there is no occasion to seek after an etymology in embers; or with Nelson, to extravagate still further to the noun *ymbren*, a recurrence, as if all holy seasons did not equally recur. In Welsh, Ember-week is *Wythnos y cŷdgorian*, the Week of the Processions.

We proceed to Christmas. In most Celtic languages Christmas Eve is called the *Night of Mary*. It is still observed with great pomp in the Isle of Man, the peasants vying with each other in bringing tapers to church, and in singing carols there. The festival itself is variously named. Our own *Christmas* comes nearest to the German provincialism, *Christfest*. The Romance languages merely retain the Latin name, the French deviating from it most widely in *Noel*. This word became a cry of joy; we find it sung at Angers, during the eight days preceding Christmas, fifteen times at the conclusion of Lauds, and it thus came to be used at other seasons of rejoicing. So, Monstrelet frequently tells us of the cry of Noel that accompanied some triumphant procession. The Welsh *Nadolig* is from the same source. The German *Weihnachten* has been derived from *Wein*, as if expressing the festal character of the day. But it is clearly from the inseparable compound *Weih*, which denotes sanctity or holiness, and occurs so often in German ecclesiastical words. Its composition with the word

Digitized by Google

night, rather than *day*, is referable to the morning mass with which the solemnity so beautifully begins. In Portugal, *Pascoa*, as the proper term for Easter, is by an easy corruption applied also to the two other great festivals. Christmas is therefore *Pascoa do Natal.*

S. Stephen's Day was in the south of France called *Straw Day*, from the benediction of the straw, which some rituals then appointed. In the north of England it is known as *Wrenning Day*, from the custom of stoning a wren to death, a cruel commemoration of S. Stephen's martyrdom. In the south, the pigeon matches usually there celebrated are a relic of the old rite. In Denmark it was sometimes called 'Second Christmas Day.'

The Holy Innocents had a peculiar appellation in England and Germany only, *Childermas Day*, and *Kindermesse*. In other languages it is simply Innocents' Day. The office of the day throughout the Church was one of sorrow; in many places *Gloria in Excelsis* was not sung: in some not even the *Gloria Patri*. The colour also was black. A trace of this remains in Leigh-upon-Mendip, in Gloucestershire, where, from time immemorial, a muffled peal has been rung on that festival. But, till a very recent period, not only that day itself, but the same day in every week of the succeeding year, was Childermas Day, and was considered highly unlucky. So the *Spectator* tells us of his superstitious hostess:—'As they began to talk of 'family affairs, a little boy at the lower end of the table told 'her, that he was to go into join-hand on Thursday. "Thurs-'day!" (says she:) "no, child, if it please God, you shall not 'begin upon Childermas Day: tell your writing master that 'Friday will be soon enough." I was reflecting with myself at 'the oddness of her fancy, and wondering that any body would 'establish it as a rule to lose one day in every week.' Addison gives the day rightly, for in the preceding year (1710) Holy Innocents fell on a Thursday.

The election of a Boy Bishop, which took place usually on S. John's Day, at night, sometimes gave rise to scenes of a very unedifying character both on Holy Innocents', and on New Year's Day. The latter was, in French, *La Fête des Soudiacres*, or more frequently, *The Feast of Fools*. The former name was intended as a kind of pun between *sou-diacres*, subdeacons, and *souls diacres*, drunken deacons; and both in the East and the West the custom gave the Bishops a good deal of trouble in putting it down, or at least restraining it within due bounds. On the contrary, in the south-east of Europe, the *Missa de idolis prohibendis* stamped quite a different character on the day, by announcing the overthrow of the profane joy which formerly welcomed in the New Year by an Idol Feast.

Digitized by Google

The Epiphany, as it contains in itself three distinct festivals, so it was to be expected that we should find it known by a variety of distinct names. In the Spanish *Epifania*, and the Italian provincialism, *Befania*, the Greek name is simply retained. In old Spanish, however, we find it called *Apparicion*, derived from the Mozarabic ritual, which gives the *Apparitio Domini*. So in the Abbey of Fontevraud, it was *L'Apparition*. Our common English name, *Twelfth Night*, marks it out as the conclusion of Christmas-tide. For the most part, however, national usages connect its title with the worship of the Magi. So in German, it is *Dreykönigstag*; in Danish, *Hellig Tre Kongers Dag*; in French, *Les Rois*; in Portuguese, *Dia dos Reis*. In England also, to some extent, the festival was known as the *Three Kings' Day*, and the practice of drawing for king is a relic of that use. In Manx, it is *Laa'l-Chybbyr-ushtey*, the day of offering worship. In the East, the case was different. Here, as every one knows, the 6th of January was at first celebrated as the Feast of the Nativity, and Manifestation to the Gentiles, both in one; and the opposite practice was introduced from the Roman Church. The name Epiphany was still, however, applied in many cases to Christmas Day, and the universally received title for our Epiphany was *The Lights*; the Sundays before and after it also deriving their name from that appellation. The title originally bore reference to the illumination of Baptism, instituted, according to the more probable opinion, on that day, and afterwards to the candles with which, as symbolical of that, the churches of the East blaze. There it is still a festival of superior importance to Christmas, and in many churches of mediæval France the case was the same; as at Rouen, where it received the name of the *Star Feast*. Again, the solemn benediction of the waters in the East, has given a title, in some countries, to the day. Thus, in Illyria and Bulgaria it is known as the *Vodocaerscta*, the 'Benediction of the Water;' in Russia, *Creshtshenie*, the Slavonic term for Baptism. In Welsh the festival is sometimes termed *Ystwyll*, gloom-expelling, sometimes *Serenwyl*, Star Festival.

The morrow of the Epiphany was popularly called *S. Distaff's Day*, from the goodwife reassuming her distaff after the Christmas holyday:—

> Partly work, and partly play,
> Ye must on Saint Distaff's Day.

But this, of course, was simply a jocular appellation. *Plough Monday*, on the contrary, had, in some rituals, its own benediction.

The Sundays after Epiphany have been named solely from

Digitized by Google

their numbers; it being very rare, even in ancient Missals, to find them called from their introits. In the north of Italy, however, the second is known as *Marriage Sunday*, from the marriage of Cana, related in the gospel for the day.

The Purification was, in one sense, to the West, what the Epiphany was to the East, and has usually received its name from the multitude of tapers employed in the office, with reference, primarily, to the Light to lighten the Gentiles, which was then manifested by the mouth of Simeon. The French Church calls it *La Chandeleur;* in Spain and Portugal it is the *Candelaria;* in Denmark, it is the *Kyndelmisse;* in Germany, as *Lichtmesse;* in Suabia, as *Kerzweihe*, or *Kerzmesse.* In Welsh it is *Gwyl Vair y Canwyllau*, the Festival of Mary of the Candles; in Manx, for a reason we cannot explain, it is *Laa'l Moirrey my Giangle*, the Day of Mary's being tied or secured. But, in the Eastern Church, it derives its name from the *meeting* of our Lord by Simeon and Anna; and is there termed *Hypapante;* by the Russian Church, with the same meaning, *Srietenie.* And this name was, as so often, transferred to the Latin Church, by which it was written *Hypapanti;* an easy corruption reduced this to *Hypanti*, which was the most frequent mediæval name. In the north of Italy it was often termed *S. Simeon's Day;* in France the name was, in many instances, the same as that in our Calendar—the *Presentation.* We also meet with that of *Susception Day.*

S. Blaise's Day is, in some parts of Germany, *Kleine Kerzmesse*—little Candlemas—because of the bonfires that it was usual (for an uncertain reason) to kindle on that night. One thing is clear—that the custom, not being peculiar to England, could not have arisen in an absurd pun on the saint's name, as some have affirmed.

The week before Septuagesima Sunday is, in the Eastern Church, called the *Exhortatory* Week, because the faithful are then exhorted to prepare themselves manfully for the great fast. The Nestorians term it the *Ninevites'* Week, on account of a fast which they observe in commemoration of the repentance of Nineveh. The Armenians, who do the same, name it, from an uncertain reason, the *Artziburion.* 'At that time,' says a Greek divine, with bitterness that recals some of Mr. Goode's polemical performances, 'the thrice accursed Armenians observe their abominable fast of Artziburion.' The Saturday of the week was known as Alleluia Saturday, because Alleluia was then, according to the most usual rule, dropped till Easter. Hence we have the beautiful hymn, *Alleluia dulce carmen*, and the magnificent *Alleluatic* sequence, appointed for that day.

Septuagesima almost everywhere retained its Latin name.

Digitized by Google

In the Eastern Church it is the *Sunday of the Prodigal Son*, that being the Gospel for the day. The week that succeeds is, in the East, *Apocreos*, because from Septuagesima Sunday meat is forbidden.

Sexagesima also had only its Latin title. In the East it is the Sunday of *Apocreos;* the weeks, at that time of the year, preceding, and not following their Sunday. The ensuing week is, in the East, *Cheese Week;* in Russia, *Butter Week;* because, till the close of the following Sunday, cheese and butter are allowed. The Friday of Sexagesima was, in the north of Germany, the *Kind-fest*, or *Kind-tag*, being, by a peculiar rite, the Festival of the Invention of the Child in the Temple.

Quinquagesima. In Germany this is, in many places, called *Pfaffen-Fastnacht* (Priest's Fasting Night), many mediæval councils having ordered ecclesiastics to abstain from meat from that day forward. It was also very widely known as *Esto mihi Sunday*, from the commencement of the introit, *Esto mihi in Deum Protectorem.* In the patois of Navarre it is *Dimenge cabée*, a corruption of *Dominica in Capite Jejunii.* In Denmark it is *Fastelavn's Sondag*, Sunday of the Preparation for the Fast. In the East, for the reason given above, it is *Butter* or *Cheese Sunday.*

The following Monday is, in England, *Collop Monday;* because, on that day, the last meat, and that in small quantities, was supposed to be cooked. In Vienne, and the adjacent parts of France, it was (and still is) *Fat Monday* (*Lundi gras*), for the following reason:—Some provincial Councils endeavoured to commence the fast, as in the East, on this day, instead of on the Wednesday; the people compromised the matter by beginning it on Tuesday, and hence this title for the last flesh-day.

Shrove Tuesday. Here, as so often, the English name is beyond all dispute the most beautiful and appropriate of any; expressing the penitence with which Lent should be welcomed in. In Southern Europe it takes its name from the exact reverse, namely, from the Carnival. In Italy it is *Martedi grasso*, as in France *Mardi gras;* also *Martedi di Carnovale.* The Spanish Church terms it *Martes de carnestolendas;* the Portuguese, *Dia do Entrudo;* or, more commonly, *Entrudo* alone; from the old word *entrudar*, to feast. Again, in France, we have *Carême entrant;* or, in the old mediæval form, *Carementramnus.* In Walloon patois, *Mâdicâmentran.* In Dansk, on the same principle as Quinquagesima Sunday, it is *Fastelavnstirstag;* in Germany it is usually known as *Fastendienstag*, Fast Tuesday. In Welsh Shrovetide is *Ynyd*, which is probably derived from *Initium* Quadragesimæ, the beginning of Lent, and thus also the Manx, *Oie-innyd.*

Digitized by Google

Ash Wednesday has, in most Churches, its name from the benediction and the wearing of ashes on that day. Thus, in German, it is *Ascher Mittwoche;* in Dansk, *Aske Onsdag;* in Illyrian, *Cista Srijda;* French, *Le jour de Cendres;* in Spanish, *Miercoles de Ceniza;* in Portuguese, *Quarta feira de cinza.* But, from also being Wednesday in *Capite Jejunii,* it is, in Navarre, *Mercré cabée,* like Quinquagesima Sunday.

Lent itself has three classes of appellations. In the first place, those derived from the season of the year, as our own *Lent,* akin to the German *Lenz,* and identical with the Dutch and the Flemish *Lente,* the season of spring. Next, those which have their origin from the idea of the fast. So in Russ it is *Velekie Post,* the Great Fast; or simply *Post,* the Fast. In Dansk, *Fastetid;* in German, *Fastenzeit.* So, in the Eastern Church, it is simply the Μεγάλη Νηστεία. Thirdly, those derived from the number of days it lasts: *Quadragesima* in Latin, *Carême* in French. And this is the case in all the Romance languages, and so also in Welsh, where Lent is *Garawys,* and, in Manx, *Kargys.* Its weeks, when numerically reckoned, are forwarder by one in the East than in the West. The first week in Lent is, according to the rite of Constantinople, that which follows Quinquagesima: according to the use of Rome it is that which follows the first Sunday in Lent.

The day after Ash Wednesday is named, in some parts of England, *Embering Thursday.*

The first Sunday in Lent. Good old Durandus labours to explain why this should be called *Quadragesima,* when, in point of fact, it is not the fortieth, but the two-and-fortieth, day from Easter. His mystical reasons, if not convincing, are at least beautiful: 'Because Lent reacheth not save to Maundy 'Thursday, which is the day of absolution; for by means of 'Lent well observed, and by true penitence, man spiritually 'cometh to the Supper of the LAMB; as it is written: "Blessed 'are they that are called to the marriage supper of the LAMB." 'Again, because the children of Israel, being fed with manna in 'the desert by the space of forty years, came, through forty 'encampments, to the Land of Promise. By whose pattern we 'also, abstaining forty days from the lusts of the body, are 'refreshed by the word of life, and give ourselves up to prayer, 'that so we may enter by JESUS CHRIST into the land of the 'living; even as they by Jesus Nave, that is, Joshua, into the 'Land of Promise.' The more common name, however, was from the introit, the Sunday *Invocavit.* So we often read: 'The emperor arrived at Metz on the Tuesday after Invocavit.' 'The Council was begun on the Wednesday of the week called 'Invocavit.' It was sometimes termed *Quintana,* because five 'undays intervened between it and Easter. Our old vernacular

name was *Shrove Sunday.* In some parts of Germany it was *Alte Fasnacht,* Old Fast Night,—a relic of the ancient commencement of Lent on the following day, before the additional four days were added to complete the forty. In the East it is *Orthodoxy Sunday,* a festival instituted primarily to commemorate the final defeat of the Iconoclasts, but extended to a general commemoration of all triumphs of the Faith.

The second Sunday in Lent is also, from the introit, the Sunday *Reminiscere.* In France it was sometimes called *Transfiguration Sunday,* because that event, according to the use of Paris, formed the Gospel of the day.

The third Sunday, or the Sunday *Oculi,* has not, to our knowledge, any vernacular name in the West, but in the East it is σταυροπροσκυνήσιμος, from the Adoration of the Cross on that day.

The fourth, or *Lætare Sunday,* is called both by the East and West, *Midlent Sunday.* In the West it is also termed *Refection Sunday,* partly because the Gospel for the day relates the feeding of the five thousand, partly because it was observed as a little carnival between the two halves of Lent; as now, the *Mi-Carême* in Paris is an occasion of great gaiety and splendour. In Rome, it is the Sunday of the *Golden Rose,* from the benediction of that token of the Pontiff's approbation. It was frequently termed in Spain the Sunday *Mediante,* because it exactly halved the old Spanish Lent, and because the Gospel commences with that word.

Thursday of the Midlent Week is, in the Eastern Church, *Thursday of the Great Canon,* because the hymn of S. Andrew of Crete, known by that name, is then sung.

The fifth Sunday is *Passion Sunday,* because then the Western Church begins her more solemn commemoration of the Passion. Then the two glorious hymns of Venuntius Fortunatus, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt,* and *Pange lingua gloriosi prœlium certaminis,* begin to be said. It was also sometimes called *Midlent Sunday,* because it follows the Midlent week; there being many instances in the West, where the Eastern example of considering the Sunday as the last day of the week may be traced. More properly it was called *Midlent Octave.* In Germany we find it named *Black Sunday,* with reference to the veiling of the crosses in black, which takes place at that passage of the Gospel, 'Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple.'

The Saturday of Passion Week, or as the Eastern Church calls it, Palm Week, was named in the south of Europe, *Alms Saturday,* it being customary to bestow charity on the poor, in remembrance of our Lord's words spoken on that day, 'Ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good.' In the East, it is appropriately name

S. Lazarus's Saturday, and often, both by East and West, *Palm Saturday*.

The sixth Sunday in Lent has a variety of names, most of them beautiful and appropriate. In England, Holland, Germany, and Denmark, it is *Palm Sunday;* in Italy, *Olive Sunday;* in Spain, Portugal, and France, *Branch Sunday;* in Welsh, *Flower Sunday*. In Russia, it is *Verknie Voscresenie, Sallow Sunday*, from the necessary employment of sallows in the procession. For a similar reason, it is in various parts of England, *Willow Sunday*, or *Yew Sunday*. Again, it was named *Tradition Sunday*, because on that day the Creed was taught to the catechumens who were to be baptized on Easter Eve; *Indulgence Sunday*, from an uncertain reason; *Palm Easter;* the *Capitilavium*, because it was then usual to wash the heads of the children, who were about to be baptized; *Flower-Easter; Easter of the Competents*, or *Pascha petitum*, because of the tradition of the Creed to those who were competent for baptism; *Hosanna Sunday*, or merely *Hosanna*, in the South of Europe, as it is in the Coptic Church. In the Greek Ritual it is simply *Palm Sunday*, though sometimes called *S. Lazarus's Sunday*. In Georgia, by a singular reference to S. Mary Magdalene, it is *Bzobisa Aghebisa*, Prostitution Sunday.

The sixth week in Lent is, in all the Romance languages, as with us, *Holy Week*. The title Passion Week, so often bestowed improperly on it among ourselves, is in Russia given to it by right, *Strastnoe Nedevie*. The Latin term, the Greater Week, *Hebdomada Major*, does not seem to have come into vernacular use. In old French it was called, as it sometimes is still, *La Semaine Peneuse*. The most beautiful term, however, as setting forth its abstraction from worldly labours, and its holy quiet, is that by which it is known in Germany and Denmark, the *Still Week*. In Germany it is also the *Marterwoche*, and *Car* or *Charwoche*, Suffering Week. In the East it is the *Great Week*, and each day has the same epithet, Great Monday, Great Tuesday, &c. Finally, in many mediæval writers, it is the *Authentic Week;* in the sense, we suppose, of *the* week,—the Week that is a week indeed; and so we have found it named in a Mayence Missal of 1519. The Welsh call it *Wythnos y Grog*, the Week of the Cross.

We come now to *Maundy Thursday*. It is rather singular that this day should not have derived its vernacular name from its great institution, the Blessed Eucharist. It had, indeed, in mediæval Latin, the name, *The Birthday of the Chalice*. So Peter of Blois:—

> Hoc in Natali Calicis non est celebratum,
> Quando Pascha novum vetus est post Pascha dicatum.

But, in modern languages, this did not obtain. In Dansk

Digitized by Google

we have the name of *Skiertorsdag*, as, in some parts of England, that of *Sheer Thursday*, from the old root *Skier*, signifying pain or affliction. In France it is simply *Jeudi Saint*, a term likely to be confounded with Ascension Day. In German it is *Grüne Donnerstag*, Green Thursday; the origin of the term is much disputed. It is probable, however, that the epithet is here to be taken in the sense of *unripe*, inasmuch as in Slavonia and Carinthia the day is called *Raw Thursday*, with what reference we are quite unable to explain. In Spain, as with us, it is *Juéves del Mandato*, from the performance of the *mandatum*, the washing of the feet. In Portugal it is *Quinta Feira de Endoenças*, Sickness Thursday, on account of the consecration of the chrism for the unction of the sick. In Welsh, with reference to the mocking of our Lord, it is *Iau y Cablyd*, Thursday of Blasphemy.

Good Friday is another example of an English appellation that surpasses in beauty the vernacular terms of other languages. But that we are so completely used to it, we should probably feel what a touching acknowledgment is the name of the work accomplished on that day. In some parts of England it is *Char-Friday*, that is, Passion Friday; a name also in use in Germany. There, however, it is usually called *Still Friday*. Denmark has a far less appropriate name, *Long Friday*. It is not a mark of very high devotion, that the length of the office should be that which has given the title to the day. *Black Friday*, a name common over Southern Germany, gives the popular view of the season, and *Holy Friday* is the somewhat common-place title adopted in most of the Romance languages. In Welsh, it is *Gwener y Croglith*, Friday of the Lesson of the Cross.

Easter Eve has in few modern languages any more recondite name than in our own. In Portugal it is *Sabbado de Alleluia*, from the triumphant resumption of the Alleluia in the first vespers of Easter. In the East, in the same way as the rest of the week, it is *Great Saturday*, except among the Armenians, who call it *Burial Saturday*.

We come now to the Queen of Festivals. And here the Greek and Latin name, in various corruptions, is almost universal; appearing in the French *Pâque*, in the Portuguese *Pascoa*, in the Illyrian *Paska*, and (which is rather strange) in the Danish *Paaske*, and the Welsh *Pasg*. The English *Easter*, and the German *Ostern*, from the goddess *Eostre*, whose feast fell in April, afford a curious instance how the Church, when it suits her, lays hold of a Pagan word, and adapts it to her highest and holiest purposes. This derivation, however, does not seem to have pleased ritualists. So, for example, the piety of Honorius of Autun is more conspicuous than his etymology

Digitized by Google

in the following sentence:—'*Oster* is from *the East*, because as 'there the Sun ariseth, who, as it were, dies in his setting, so 'here the Sun of Righteousness, which is Christ, who, as it 'were, sets in his Death, rises again.' Others will deduce from *Urstand*, the Resurrection. But these are vain attempts to get rid of an etymology, of which, after all, there is nothing to be ashamed. In Manx, it is *Yn-chaisht*, 'The Holy.' In the East, the common title is Λαμπρά, the Bright Day. Thus a Cretan ballad, describing the celebration of the principal feasts of the Church:—

τοῦ Χριστουγέννου γιὰ κήρι,
καὶ τοῦ βαΐου γιὰ βαΐα·
καὶ τῆς Λαμπρῆς τὴν κυριακὴν
γιὰ τὸ 'Χριστὸς ἀνέστη.'

At Christmas tapers kindle,
At Palmtide Palm-gifts bring;
And then upon *Bright Sunday*
"The Lord is risen," we sing.

The use is the same in the Russian Church, where Easter Day is the *Svietloe Voscresenie*.

The Octave of Easter is, with us, *Low Sunday*, probably from the contrast between the rapturous joy of Easter, and the more ordinary routine to which we now return. At the same time, in every part of the Western Church, it is a Sunday of the first class. In the Latin Church, it is the *Dominica in Albis*, that is, *in Albis depositis*, because then the recently baptized laid aside their white robes. But the Germans, translating exactly from the Latin, call it *der weisse Sontag*, for precisely the reason that it is not white. It is as often called the Sunday *Quasimodo*, from the introit. In the canton of Soleure, in Switzerland, it is *Bean Sunday*, on account of a certain distribution of beans which then takes place, and by which the translation of some of the Martyrs of the Theban Legion is commemorated. In the East, it is *New Sunday*, with reference to the Renovation of all things by our Lord's Resurrection.

Mundi renovatio
Nova parit gaudia:
Resurgente Domino
Conresurgunt omnia.

It is thus named also by the Armenians. The Greeks frequently call it *Antipascha*, and also *S. Thomas's Sunday*, in commemoration of his conversion on that day.

While in Easter-tide, we must not forget to mention the *Annotine Easter*. This was a commemoration of the preceding Easter, made on that day in the following year. There is a

Digitized by Google

sequence for this festival—the only one with which we are acquainted—in Mr. Neale's collection, beginning,

Surgit Christus cum trophæo,
Jam ex Agno factus Leo.

As, however, Annotine Easter fell often in Lent, and sometimes in Passion-tide, it was in most Churches transferred either to the Sunday *Quasimodo*, or to the Fourth Sunday after Easter, or in some cases, to Saturday in the Octave. The origin of its institution seems to have been the natural wish of those baptized at Easter, to celebrate the first anniversary of their spiritual illumination.

The Second Sunday after Easter. This, in the Eastern Church, is the Sunday of the Ointment-bearers (*τῶν μυροφορῶν*), from the Gospel. In the Armenian Calendar, it is *Green Sunday*, because the spring is now, at latest, bursting forth.

The Third Sunday after Easter. This, for a similar reason to that mentioned above, is, in the East, the *Sunday of the Paralytic.* Why the Armenian Church calls it *Beautiful Sunday*, we know not.

The Fourth Sunday after Easter is, with the Greeks, Mid-Pentecost, from dividing the time between Easter and Whit-Sunday. Also, from the Gospel, it is the *Sunday of the Samaritan.*

The fifth is *Rogation Sunday*, with the three Rogation Days following. In Germany this is the *Betsontag*, with the same meaning: in other languages the Latin term seems almost invariably followed. The Oriental Church, retaining the old rule of admitting no fast between Easter and Pentecost, has no such season, and therefore no such name. The Gotho-Hispanic Church, wishing to observe the Rogations, and yet unwilling to break the canon, transferred them either to the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in the week of Pentecost, or else to the Ides or to the Kalends of December. In the East, Rogation Sunday is the *Sunday of the Blind Man*, from the Gospel.

Ascension Day has scarcely any vernacular name. In some parts of the south of France it was termed *Bread Thursday*, from a distribution of bread which then was made to the poor; probably with reference to that verse of the Psalm, 'Thou art gone up on high: Thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men.' In England it has been known as *Bounds Thursday;* from beating the bounds of the parish, transferred, by a corruption of Rogation processions, to this day. In Manx, it is *Jasdyl*, which they derive from *Jas*, God, and *theill*, the world, because God on that day went up to Heaven from the world. In Russia, they use an especial term for this day, instead of the more ordinary word for *Ascension:* calling it *Voznesenie*, and not *Voschojdenie.* The Eastern Church knows

Digitized by Google

of no especial title for the festival, except that, in Cappadocia, from an uncertain reason, it was the *Episozomene.*

The Sunday after Ascension is so called all over the West. But in the East it is termed the *Sunday of the Three Hundred and Eighteen,* from the commemoration which then takes place of the Fathers of Nicæa.

Whit Sunday. It is strange that the origin of our vernacular name for the third festival of the Christian year should be so difficult to discover. We will not discuss the disputed question, whether it is named from the white worn by the recently baptized from Easter till Pentecost, or is a corruption of *huit:* this being the eighth Sunday after Easter. The Romance languages have, for the most part, vernacularized the Latin name. But in Spain the day is usually called the *Fiesta del Espirito Santo;* and in Portugal, by the use of the word Pascha we already noticed, *Pascoa do Espirito Santo.* In Italy it is *Pasqua Rosata,* because the roses are now in full flower. In Germany. it is *Pfingsten,* probably (for the derivation is doubtful) a corruption of Pentecost. The name will suggest to some of our readers Göthe's beautiful imitation of Reynard the Fox:—

> Pfingsten, das liebliche Fest, war gekommen: es grünten und blüthen
> Feld und Wald: auf Hügeln und Höhn, in Büschen und Hecken,
> Uebten ein fröhliches Lied die neuermunterten Vögel, &c.

In Dansk, by an easy abbreviation, it is *Pintse-Dag.* From the season, German every-day speech names a number of common objects: thus, green geese are *Pentecost geese;* the peony is the *Pentecost rose;* broom is *Pentecost-blossom.* In Russ it is *Troitzie Den,* Trinity Day; probably as filling up the commemoration of the blessed Trinity. In the East it is, of course, Pentecost.

The Friday in the Octave is, among the Nestorians, named *Golden Friday.* For that day of the week being a high commemoration throughout the year, this, in its most sacred season, is supposed to bear the palm from the others; and hence its title.

It was not to be expected that *Trinity Sunday,* as a day of such late institution, should have left much trace in modern languages. In old French it was popularly called the *King of Sundays;* also *Blessed Sunday.* In the Eastern Church it is *All Saints'* Sunday, that commemoration being fixed for this day. The office itself was long unsettled in the Western Church. The original collect for the First Sunday after Pentecost was that which begins, 'O God, the strength of all them that put their trust in Thee,' and it is still retained in the Roman Missal as an adjunct to the festival of the Trinity.

Digitized by Google

The German Church was very tenacious of the old rite. Some celebrated the new festival on the second Sunday after Pentecost, so as to leave the octave clear; large numbers transferred it to the Sunday next before Advent: and this was, we believe, retained in some parts of Rhineland to the last century, if indeed there be not even now a double commemoration. So it was at Orleans till the sixteenth century.

Corpus Christi also, as a late festival, comes under the same head as the last. That, in England, as abroad, it was called from the Body of God, the vulgar oath still remains to tell. The French Church has abreviated it still further, into the Fête Dieu.

The Sundays following Trinity are, in the Roman Calendar, as every one knows, called from Pentecost. But in the Sarum, and in most German Missals, they are named, as we name them, from Trinity.

We may observe that in the north of England, and especially in Yorkshire, the Sunday within the Octave of the Patron, or Wake Saint, is called after his name. Thus, at Ripon, *Wilfrid Sunday* is a very great holiday.

It merely remains to notice the other holidays which have received an English vernacular name.

Of these Lady Day shall be the first. That this term was fixed to the Annunciation and not to the Assumption, shows that, in the earlier times of England, the present respective importance of the festivals was reversed. In Dansk it is the same, *Vor Fruedag;* but in other European tongues it is simply the Annunciation. In Welsh it is *Gwyl Vair y Cyhydedd,* the Festival of Mary of the Equinox; in Manx, prettily enough, *Laa'l-Moirrey-my-Sansh,* the Day of Mary's being whispered to.

Lammas Day, the Feast of S. Peter ad Vincula. It would be most natural to derive this from Loaf-mas, that is, the benediction of the new bread. But when we find the first of August termed in Welsh *Dydd degwm ŵyn,* Lamb-tithing day, it is clear that the easier derivative, Lamb-mas Day, is also the true one. The Manx name has in all likelihood the same origin; it is *Laa'l Lkuanys. Lhuan* is any creature, more especially a lamb or calf, which comes out of due season. It was probably the absence of an octave, as compared with the great festival of S. Peter, that led to the proverbial idiom, *At latter Lammas;* that is, never: or, as the Danes say, on the 30th of February. In Germany the day is *Kettenfeier,* the Feast of the Chains,—a literal translation of the Latin.

The same feeling which suggested the English benediction showed itself in all the wine countries on the sixth of August. This was the benediction of the new grapes;—and the rite was

Digitized by Google

often performed, as at S. Martin of Tours, by squeezing a grape into the chalice after consecration. So we have *Le jour des raisins*, in Germany, *Traubentag;* in the Moselle districts, *Liebfrauenmilchtag*, the Day of the Milk of our Dear Lady (from the celebrated wine so called); in the dialect of Alsace and Strasbourg, *Waînbaîredag*. The Benediction of the Grapes took place on the same day in the East.

An instance is within our knowledge of the endowment of a Post-Reformation Sermon, "to be preached on Lady Day in harvest," *i.e.* on the Assumption.

Saint Monday is, properly speaking, the Monday after S. Crispin: a great holiday. In Dansk it is *Frimandag*, Holiday Monday: why the Germans call it Blue Monday we know not.

Hallowmas, or *All Hallows*, or *All Holland*, has scarcely any peculiar name elsewhere than among ourselves. In Germany it is simply *Allerheiligen;* and in the Romance languages, a pure translation of *Festum Omnium Sanctorum*.

All Souls. This, in Welsh, is *Gwyl y meirw*, the Festival of the Dead, and sometimes, more poetically, *Gwyl cenad y meirw*, the Festival of the Embassy of the Dead. In Spanish it is *El dia de las animas;* in Portuguese, more curiously, it is the *Dia dos finados*, from *finado*, a dead body. In Italy it is the *Giorno de' morti*. In Germany, precisely as with us.

St. Thomas's Eve is, in Manx, *Oie'l-fingan*, the Eve of Cliffs; because men then went out on the cliffs to shoot venison for the approaching Christmas Festival.

This list might, undoubtedly, with greater research, and wider opportunity, be well-nigh indefinitely extended. We believe, for example, that the nearly unknown Basque has very curious ecclesiastical terms: we are told that the Wallachian, notwithstanding its almost literal derivation from the Latin, is rich in the same. In short, wherever the Church was early planted, there her influence over domestic language will appear very strongly; where she was not established till a late period, there such vernacularisms are scarcely, or not at all, perceptible. This, we believe, is true to a great extent in Bohemia, more so in Poland, and still more so in Lithuania. But the examples which have been produced will not have been given in vain, if they lead any one to consider how completely the Church should mingle herself with the household words of her children, and should, even in this sense, become all things to all men.

Digitized by Google

ART. V.—*Report of the Trial and Preliminary Proceedings in the case of the Queen on the Prosecution of G. Achilli* v. *Dr. Newman. With an Introduction, containing Comments on the Law and on the course of the Trial; also with the Pleadings and Affidavits; and copious Notes, particularly on the Constitution and Practice of the Court of Inquisition. By* W. F. FINLASON, ESQ., *of the Middle Temple, Barrister at Law, Author of 'Leading Cases in Pleading,' 'Charitable Trusts,' &c. Third Edition.* Dolman. 1852.

WHATEVER may be the defects in regard to knowledge, ability, or discretion—whatever the obliquities in theology, or errors in taste, for which this review may be answerable, there is one merit to which it may lay an indisputable claim, in common, we hope, with the other religious reviews of the country, viz. that it may safely lie upon the drawing-room tables of respectable families. Nor, it is needless to say, do we undervalue this measure of success, which is creditable as far as it goes, though it would be a false and uncalled-for humility to say that we do not aim at something higher. An ordinary reader, however, whose eye casually rested on the title of the publication prefixed to this article, would certainly deserve some excuse, if he came for the moment to an opposite opinion. A review that undertakes a comment on the Achilli trial would seem at first sight to have adopted a certain indifference to the merit of respectability, and in the pursuit of a theological name, to have flung aside its social, as if that were a thing too homely and mediocre to care about. Who can touch pitch and not be defiled? Who can make observations on the Achilli trial which may be fit for the ears of respectable men and women? Such will probably be the idea of many of our readers, on this article first catching their attention. For the sake of such apprehensions, therefore, we hasten to announce that this review does not undervalue and despise the praise of being a respectable one, and that we do not intend to offend the most delicate and refined ear. The inference which we shall draw from this trial will not depend on any of the details of that elaborate interior which divines of the sister Church have so industriously thrown open to the public; it will only require the large and general facts of the case for its support.

We shall commence, then, with asking—and we do it with

some degree of amazement—What could have possessed those divines, that they should have been so zealous and so anxious to make this disclosure, to throw open to the eyes of a Protestant public these most shocking and disgraceful scenes, carried on within the bosom of their own Church? Certainly, if from the individual Achilli proceeds the great danger of the Roman Church; if he personally is the formidable foe, the one agent whose plots are to be undermined, and whose power is to be overthrown, they may be said to have gained a triumph; for they have undoubtedly suppressed Achilli. But the formidable foe of the Roman Church is not the individual Achilli, but the Protestant world, and how as between them and the latter party does the case issue? Without professing any particular sympathy with the proceedings of the Protestant public in the matter of Achilli, we cannot in common candour deny that they have a good defence to make. The news is brought to them one day of the conversion of a distinguished Roman Catholic divine to Protestantism. As they never heard his name before, they cannot be supposed to know anything about his private life and character. All they know is, that he has held places of honour and responsibility in his own communion. Is it not natural that such a convert should be welcomed, and made much of?—that, according to the fashion of the day, he should be encouraged to appear on platforms, write pamphlets, and exhibit his testimony in every possible shape? Who can find fault with a religious party for hailing an accession from the ranks of the foe, and making every use of him? But in a little while charges are brought against the moral character of the new ally, and he is alleged to have lived a profligate life. What course does the party that has welcomed him then take? They compel him to meet these charges in a court of law, and on his failing to refute the evidence for his guilt, they give up all connexion with him, in spite of the shield which judge and jury have thrown over him. The Protestant party then might certainly have shown more caution and dignity, and abstained from parading a new convert before time and further acquaintance had proved him; but no moral offence is attributable to it. On the other hand, the Roman Church has to account for her treatment of, and conduct to, this man, while he was living this immoral life, and while she knew what his character was. She has to account not only for indulgence to, but for the positive promotion to dignities and important spiritual cures, of a known and proved profligate. She has to account for gross laxity of discipline, and indifference to plain moral considerations. As between Achilli and the Church of Rome, then, the issue of this trial is favourable enough to the latter party; but as between

Digitized by Google

the Church of Rome and the Protestant public, that issue has been anything but favourable to her. It may be said that the discovery that a convert to Protestantism is an immoral man is itself a point gained, and justifies the taunt,—'See what sort of stuff your converts are made of.' But the other side may say that an individual instance does not prove much, and that all parties are liable to the reproach of unworthy members. If immoral men have become converts to Protestantism, immoral men have also become converts to Rome. The accession of an immoral convert is indeed an unpleasant fact to the party he has joined. But what is the scandal of such a fact—one which burdens the party affected by it with no real responsibility whatever, (for who could have prevented it?)—compared with that of a definite course of proceeding pursued by a body, which could have acted otherwise, and is therefore strictly responsible for such conduct;—with the scandal of gross laxity, the deliberate patronage and promotion of a known immoral man, the appointment to a succession of spiritual cures of the most tender and trying kind, of a priest against whom their own spiritual courts, secret though they were, had but just proved and recorded abominable offences. What is there in the indiscretion of prematurely parading a new and unknown convert, compared with the moral guilt of this connivance at, this encouragement of vice? We have for our own part no concern with Achilli one way or another. He did not join the Church of England. But that candour, to which even such opponents in theology as Lord Shaftesbury and Sir Cullen Eardly have a right at our hands, obliges us to state clearly the impression which this case has left upon us.

We naturally ask then, with some surprise, what could have induced the divines of the Roman Church to press forward this disclosure so zealously as they have? One would suppose, from the tone which they have adopted, that they had shown us some marvellously bright and perfect system in operation. But the minds of controversialists generally, and especially theological ones, are—happily for their own inward comfort and self-complacency, though not, perhaps, to their credit or real influence as arguers—so constructed that they only see that side of a matter which is favourable to them, and forget the other. The Romanist divines have been so absorbed in the halloo and pursuit of an antagonist, that they have forgotten their own defences; so occupied in exposing another that they have not seen that they were exposing themselves at the same time, disclosing the corruptions and weaknesses of their own system. Had they realized this we cannot but think that their tone would have been a more modified one. And we will apply this remark

especially to the piece of rhetoric which was the immediate cause of this trial. That the inner tone of—we grieve to be obliged to call it—fierce exultation which pervades Dr. Newman's address to Achilli applied to that person individually, we should be the last to believe, because we could not believe this without thinking worse of Dr. Newman than of Achilli himself; for no one can exult over a fallen brother without himself in the very act falling lower. The exultation which marks the passage was not over Achilli, but over the Protestant public by whom Achilli had been brought forward and paraded. Had Dr. Newman, however, reflected how much more his own Church had had to do with Achilli than the Protestant public had; how much more she was implicated in a guilt which her own connivance had fostered, he would, we venture to think, have subdued that triumph.

The impression which a first view leaves upon the mind, as regards the bearings of this case on the Roman Church, is not weakened, but confirmed, when we come to a more accurate inspection. And we will premise with saying, that, whatever statements we put forward in this article respecting Achilli, we do not put forward as our own, but simply as the statements, true or false, of the Roman Catholic party.

The year 1826 finds Achilli a Dominican monk, an ordained priest, and professor of philosophy at the Seminary or College of Viterbo, a city in the Papal States, about forty miles from Rome. As yet no charges have been brought against him, but he bears the reputation of an able and eloquent young divine, a rising ecclesiastic. But gradually the cloud gathers: in the course of five or six years charges begin to spread against him; the Rev. Joseph Giotti testifying that he had by that time acquired a bad reputation. In the year 1833 proceedings were instituted against him in the Bishop's Court at Viterbo for two different offences, the miserable details of one of which were given in the recent trial before the Queen's Bench. A third was shortly added. The Court sentenced him to 'a deprivation of his faculties:' but the sentence was not very efficient. He left Viterbo, and went to Rome; at which place, to use Sir A. Cockburn's words, 'having strong friends,' he was able to defeat justice, and 'the affair was hushed up.'

But the suppression of justice is a small part of that line of proceeding for which the Church of Rome stands responsible in this matter. It might have been expected indeed that the authorities would have been content to have stopped here: it was a sufficiently bold indulgence to such definite and gross crimes. But they proceeded further, and immediately conferred upon him a most important and responsible office, that

Digitized by Google

of Prefect of Studies and Head Professor of the College of Minerva at Rome, a magnificent ecclesiastical seminary. He was, moreover, as if the authorities considered that a notorious criminal was specially suited to the task of reforming and correcting the faults of others, and was likely to be a patron of that sound discipline which he had so much deserved, and so little experienced,—appointed to accompany the Provincial of the Dominican Order in the Roman States on a Visitation tour, as his adviser and *amicus curiæ*. The writer of an article in the Dublin Review of June, 1850, does indeed try to ward off from the Roman Church the disgrace of this appointment, by showing that it was not that kind of appointment which Achilli had described it to be. But he fails in his effort. Achilli may have exaggerated his office, and have been guilty of a misstatement in describing himself as on this occasion 'Visitor' of the Dominicans. But the fact is clear that he went on a Visitation tour, and was a companion of the Provincial and Visitor throughout it, and apparently an official and confidential one.

But honours descend thick upon Achilli. A higher and more spiritual office than that even of a professor of an ecclesiastical seminary, or a visitor of an ecclesiastical order, awaits him. The task of the Lent preacher is an especially apostolic one, requiring all the zeal and fervour of an exalted piety. He has to come into the most intimate contact with the heart, and stir up from the lowest depths the religious affections and convictions of a Christian congregation. He has to awaken the dull and lethargic, to soften the obdurate, to calm and soothe the sensitive and timorous soul. The most awful and the most tender labours are entrusted to him; and he is the shepherd of the spiritual flock at the most trying and solemn season of the Church's year. Even the most lax authorities might have been expected to pause, before they conferred such an office on a man fresh from a trial in an ecclesiastical court, at which the worst offences had been proved against him. But the Roman authorities are bold. At the commencement of 1835, hardly more than a year after the proof of his guilt had been recorded, he received from the Cardinal Archbishop of Capua an invitation to preach the Lent sermons, in the Cathedral, and in the Collegiate Church of S. Maria di Capua, of that city.—The invitation he accepts, receiving together with it a natural appendage to such an office, the authority to hear confessions. Proceeding from Capua to Naples, a new post awaits his acceptance in the latter city. He is appointed Prior of the Convent of S. Peter Martyr. These appointments bring him into the most intimate and delicate connexion with both sexes; they give him, to quote the article just alluded to, 'access to establishments of female

education,' and to the management and superintendence of 'pious associations of men and women.' Considering the peculiar offences of which he had been guilty, therefore, they are just the appointments which it was most indecent to entrust to him. What wonder if such an official—we quote our contemporary again—'made use of the facilities which his religious character gave him;' if he established a *Pia Unione* of both sexes at Naples, of which one of the fruits was the seduction of a young female member?

We naturally ask, after such facts have been stated, what could have occasioned such appointments; what could have justified them in any way to the minds of those who made them; what excuse there could have been; whether it was possible that the misdemeanours of the promoted ecclesiastic had not reached their ears, so that they promoted him in ignorance of his real character? We look for such circumstances of palliation, but look in vain. Viterbo is about forty miles from Rome. A sentence, therefore, passed in an ecclesiastical court at Viterbo, could hardly have not reached Rome; and besides, the affair, we are told, was 'hushed up' at the latter place: it was therefore known to begin with. The appointment then of Achilli to the professorship in the College of Minerva, was made in the full knowledge of what his character was, and what offences he had recently committed. Again, Capua is something more than a hundred miles on the other side of Rome to Viterbo; so that Viterbo and Capua are about as distant from each other as London and Exeter. It is true, indeed, there were neither then, nor are now, railroads which connect this trio of cities together; nor probably were the coaches between them first rate. Nor probably did the post convey letters from the most northern to the most southern of these cities in the course of the night. Still Viterbo (Rome, we need not say) and Capua are considerable towns. There are regular roads, and there is a regular system of travelling from one to the other. There is also a post which conveys letters—we will hazard the assertion—in three or four days from one to the other of these towns. It would then, we presume, be known at Viterbo that Achilli was preaching the Lent course of sermons at Capua. Now we are told that, at Viterbo, Achilli had a wide scandalous reputation, and also that he was formally condemned in the episcopal court there. When the appointment then of Achilli to the Lent preachership at Capua was made public, was there no one at Viterbo to inform the Cardinal Archbishop of the condition in which his nominee stood as to character? If the secret ecclesiastical tribunal could not speak, or confide even to a princely ecclesiastic its formal record, was

there no one in the whole of Viterbo to write a letter by post to the Archbishop of Capua, to tell what the real fact was. Where were all the pious priests, professors, students of Viterbo, that they could witness the scandal of such a delinquent assuming the spiritual mien, and pretending to awaken consciences, and terrify lethargic sinners,—and do and say nothing? What a mockery of every thing sacred to be seen with unconcern—the affecting appeal, the rousing warning, the eye raised to heaven, the hand waved in energy and emotion, the voice rolling in thunder or softened to a whisper, to express judgment or mercy, the loud summary call to the profligate, the profane, the sensual, to give up their dream of pleasure and turn to God,—the text, urged with apostolic vehemence, 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead' —all this exhibition proceeding from a hardened offender, who had just come out of an ecclesiastical court. We cannot suppose, then, that Capua remained in ignorance of Achilli's character. The same observations may be applied to the appointment to the Priory of the Monastery at Naples. Naples is about five-and-twenty miles from Capua—an addition, but not a formidable one to the line of posts which connect Viterbo with the scenes of Achilli's promotion. Intelligence of the appointment at Naples then would, we presume, reach Viterbo; intelligence of the offences at Viterbo would reach Naples.

There is one explanation, indeed, of such an employment of patronage, which deserves notice for its originality, though it cannot be said to satisfy the demands of a rigorous inquirer, or solve the difficulties of an intelligent one. The writer of the article in our contemporary, to which we have referred, accounts for these promotions on the idea that they were conferred with the intention of 'reclaiming' the offender. 'This good man,' is his remark, alluding to M. Brochetti, the Provincial of the Dominicans, 'wishing to *reclaim*, if possible, Achilli, and to show how he believed him to be sincerely penitent, took him with him on his tour of visitation.' 'He was unhappily,' our contemporary adds, a few pages after, 'appointed prior of a convent in Naples, *always in the hope of reclaiming him.*' These important and honourable posts then, that of conducting, with the Provincial of his Order, a visitation tour, and that of the Headship of a religious house, were conferred upon him with the view of correcting his vices and softening his heart. For the same reason, we presume, he was also appointed to the Professorship of the college of Minerva at Rome, and to the office of Lent preacher in Capua. Now we cannot hope to vie with our Romanist contemporary in the knowledge of the true principles of penance, and therefore we may easily be mistaken on such

Digitized by Google

a subject: still we must confess that this is the first time we ever heard that the proper method of reclaiming a criminal, was to give him a comfortable and lucrative post in which to repose after his misdemeanour. To us, who are not in the secret on this subject, such a consequence looks much more like a reward than a punishment. Nor should we advise that such a judicial plan should be divulged; for it would certainly lead to the increase of crime even more than absolute impunity. The common supposition has always been that evil actions deserve shame and privation. But here, the criminal, instead of meeting shame and privation, is promoted to a succession of offices which gratify his ambition and comfortably replenish his purse. He is even specially singled out for the task of reforming others, and promoting and enforcing that spiritual discipline of which he has been himself the most signal infringer. Is this the way to soften the heart and correct the morals of an offender, or is it the way to harden and dullen him; to make him suppose that the religious society to which he belongs does not care much for what he has done, and that his offences have been, after all, only the natural results of his calling, with its peculiar restriction and consequent temptations, and were a sort of matter of course?

It may be said, however,—though the defence would not go to show that such a treatment of crime was justifiable, but only to show that some atonement was ultimately made for it, allowing it to be scandalous—it may be said that Achilli was at last brought to trial, and received from the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome the punishment due to his offences. We say the tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome, for we cannot suppose that the sentence of the episcopal court of Viterbo, earlier in his career, will be adduced. That sentence was plainly ineffective, and was ridden over. It was not allowed the virtue of a judicial sentence, and therefore we shall not count it. But to this defence, partial as it may be, we have some exceptions to make.

In the first place, then, we must remark, that this trial did not take place, this sentence was not pronounced till the criminal's course of guilt and profligacy had reached its tenth year. This is at any rate tardy justice: the year 1831 marked Achilli a criminal; the year 1841 records the sentence of the Inquisition upon him. In the interval between these two dates he pursues his immoral career unchecked, nor unchecked only, but honoured and promoted. For ten years he has the run of the Church's field, he has all the facilities that responsible station can put into his hands for effecting his bad purposes, and he takes ample advantage of them.

Digitized by Google

But, in the next place, safely as we might concede the small merit of so dilatory a justice to the Roman Church, an attentive survey of the facts of the case forbids us to suppose that even such justice was the consequence of any intrinsic and hearty disgust at immorality, and sympathy with the wrongs of an injured flock. It appears rather to have been a concession, so far as it took place upon the moral ground at all—to a long and wide accumulation of scandal, which could not any longer be resisted. There is a certain growth of crime which, under the worst and laxest judicial systems, must be noticed, and the most cowed and callous public opinion will point out at last an offender with a decision that cannot safely be despised. Some scandal appears to have accompanied Achilli's career from the first. A witness informs us that his reputation was bad at Viterbo. This sense of scandal indeed cannot have been a very potent and indignant one, otherwise it would have compelled an earlier notice of, and obedience to it, than a sentence in the year 1841. But even a weak sense of scandal grows into a strong one if the provocation to it accumulates; and by the end of ten years Achilli seems to have become sufficiently notorious to make it almost unsafe to leave him any longer untouched. He was noticed in the reports of the police as a person who was corrupting the public morals. Indeed, even the residuum of merit, whatever it may be, which the Roman courts may claim, after the deductions we have made, does not appear wholly to belong to them, but to be shared, and that in the greater proportion, by the police. Strange as it may appear, under a system which grudges the State any control whatever over members of the priestly order, even if guilty of civil crimes, and would make all justice in their case ecclesiastical; the secular police seem to have been the prime movers in the matter of bringing Achilli to justice. In the first proceeding against him at Viterbo, the police come forward, though not as prime movers,—for it does not appear which party moved first, the ecclesiastical or the civil,—still, as movers, and authoritative ones. The head of the police in that city put him into his official report—a report from which the writer of the article in our contemporary professes to have 'derived his information' respecting Achilli's conduct in that place. But the conclusive proceedings against him, at the tribunal of the Inquisition, are preceded by a very definite and strong act of the police. 'The Neapolitan authorities,' we quote from the same article an official despatch, with the sight of which the writer had been favoured, 'having satisfied themselves 'with the truth of the charge' [we need not mention what sort of charge], 'took measures for the removal of the delinquent 'friar. This was effected on the 8th of September, 1840. But

'instead of proceeding to the convent assigned to him, he went 'to a relation's house, whence he returned stealthily to Naples, 'only to be expelled thence a second time, on the 21st of 'February, 1841.' 'Be it remembered,' adds our contemporary, 'that it is not the Inquisition that here speaks, nor is it any 'ecclesiastical, nor is it any Roman tribunal. It is the police 'of another kingdom.' The Neapolitan police, then, heard the charge which the indignant father brought against the delinquent friar; the Neapolitan police punished the delinquent. But where were the ecclesiastical authorities all this time? where was the episcopal court? 'The history of our Achilli's sojourn at Naples,' says our contemporary, 'was that of a man 'hiding himself from the observation of the police.' But why should he hide himself from the observation of the police especially? why did this discreet, if not commendable fear, not extend also to the ecclesiastics of Naples? Were the interests of morality less dear to the Church than to the State? Are police officers the natural correctors of priests? Such appears, however, to have been their position at Naples. It is when a priest has been long under the eye of the police, has been inscribed as a black sheep in their reports, and has actually been expelled from the city, that the Roman ecclesiastical court at last takes him to task. The act of the police dates in the February, and the act of the Roman ecclesiastical court dates in the June of 1841.

But a further reduction must be made. It does not appear that even now the moral ground was at all the principal one on which the Ecclesiastical Court stepped forward in Achilli's case. The Court of the Inquisition has been popularly regarded in this country as a tribunal taking cognizance of doctrinal offences only. It appears from the evidence of a Roman Catholic Bishop, Dr. Grant, that it takes cognizance of moral offences also, and the document which was produced in evidence at the late trial before the Queen's Bench, under the signature of the Notary of that Court, certainly makes mention of moral offences. Still we can hardly be wrong in supposing that the Court of the Inquisition is a Court designed for the preservation and guardianship of doctrine principally, and taking cognizance mainly of doctrinal offences. Now the Court which condemned Achilli was the Court of the Inquisition. It is difficult upon the mere fact of the selection of such a court to try him, to avoid the conjecture that some questions of doctrine mixed with those of morals in Achilli's case, and that the former had at least some share in exciting ecclesiastical justice to a sense of its duty.

But we are not left to conjectural inference here. It is confessed by our contemporary that Achilli was arraigned on the

Digitized by Google

charge of heresy, together with that of immorality. 'It is true,' he says, speaking of the period preceding his trial at the Inquisition, 'that Achilli about this period did begin, if covertly he 'had not begun before, to speak against faith, and not only 'against faith, but also against morals; that his language be-'came scandalous, that he perverted others, and that to him 'was attributed the sad fall, in morals first, and then in faith, of 'F. Desanctis, a priest of the order of S. Camillus, now in Malta, 'whither we believe he bore him the partner of his guilt. We 'have no wish to conceal Achilli's lurking heterodoxy, because 'we believe it to be in him, as in most apostates, a natural result; 'corrupt morals necessarily beget a corrupt faith..... Achilli 'therefore was by this time either virtually or in thought, in 'desire, in wish, perhaps even in intention, no longer a Catholic. 'And *therefore* he is acknowledged to have been and to continue 'a Protestant—a Protestant of five years' standing. .... Such 'being the case it is no wonder that he got into troubles with the 'Inquisition, before which he was summoned in 1841. He was 'arraigned for his unsound principles, not merely held but 'openly expressed, in regard to morals and to faith. But he 'was arraigned also for his gross immoralities from the begin-'ning, including those committed in Capua.'

We may safely leave it to the reader, upon this extract, to form his own conclusion as to the share which the doctrinal and the moral grounds respectively had in the trial of Achilli. It states that he had begun to speak against the faith, also to speak against morals; that he had ceased to be a Catholic, and had become a Protestant in heart: that 'such being the case it was no wonder that he got into troubles with the Inquisition.' Here is an alternation of the moral and the doctrinal ground; but which takes the precedence? If the moral, why is it not first of all said that Achilli was brought before the Inquisition to answer for his immoral conduct? Why, when he had been engaged for ten years in a course of licentious *acts*, is he arraigned in the first instance for his words—for *speaking* against faith and morals? What is this 'speaking against morals,' which is forsooth so much greater an offence than acting against them? Certainly, the systematic defence of immorality would ordinarily show a worse heart than immoral conduct alone would; but as showing this, why not have included it in one first and foremost charge against him of immorality, instead of dividing the two and subordinating both to a charge of speaking against the faith. With such appearances, we shall beg leave to consider, until proof appears to the contrary, that the charge which mainly and principally brought Achilli before the Inquisition was a charge of heresy; though when

Digitized by Google

the heretic already stood before the tribunal, his immoralities obtained a glad notice as the accompaniments of heterodoxy, even if they got none upon their own intrinsic ground. Looking at the facts of the case from the first, it does certainly appear to us far from certain, that had Achilli abstained from the crowning act of heresy, the Court would have given itself the trouble to investigate his morals. He goes on for years in a licentious course, and is not degraded or even reprimanded; he retains his emoluments, his spiritual rank; it is only when he is discovered to be heterodox, that he is brought to judgment: morals may be connived at, but heresy is unpardonable.

And on this subject we cannot but make the remark, that it would have been more satisfactory had the defendant's side, in the late trial before the Queen's Bench, allowed the whole of the record of the proceedings before the Inquisition to have appeared before the Court, instead of a partial description of it drawn up by the notary; all the counts on which Achilli was arraigned, instead of a selection from them. A selection made by an individual officer of the tribunal, upon instructions received from a party in this country, leaves a residue behind the scenes, of which perfect openness and fairness feel the absence. Nor is it easy to avoid the conjecture, that had the record of the tribunal been allowed to appear whole, or a whole description of it to be given, the charge of heresy would have been seen occupying an inconvenient precedence in it. 'We cannot indeed,' as Sir A. Cockburn justly observes, 'dictate to continental Courts in what form they should draw up their judgments,' but we may fairly require, that however roughly these may be drawn up, the notary who gives us the description of them, should describe the whole of them and not a part. It is certain, from the admissions of the other side, that there were counts against Achilli, at this trial, besides those relating to his immorality. But these latter counts are the only ones allowed to appear in the document produced before the Queen's Bench.

We will take leave of this part of our subject with one remark; and that is, that however solemn the sentence which this tribunal may have passed on Achilli, and whatever the grounds on which it was passed, there is nothing to make us suppose, that it would have been much more lasting or efficient than that of the Court of Viterbo, had Achilli remained in the Roman Church. There is nothing to show that the profession of orthodoxy, a nominal adherence, and a readiness to give his Church the benefit of his eloquence and talents, would not have negatived the effects of the last trial, as they did that of the first, and Achilli have been seen in a short time going on much the same as before, preaching Lent sermons, and presiding over monastic and collegiate

Digitized by Google

bodies. His conversion to Protestantism has at any rate precluded this result, and left the judgment of the Roman Court in fossil permanency and force, unshaken but untried.

We have now another task to perform, and that is, to give our own explanation of these facts—this course of connivance and promotion which we have been contemplating. It will not pretend to the certainty of demonstration, but it will at any rate equal in force and probability the explanation which our contemporary has attempted,—in assigning for the motives of this indulgence, the pious design of 'reclaiming' the unhappy offender who was the recipient of it.

Examining these facts upon the principles of common sense, we feel it difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than this: that where immoral acts of a certain class, committed again and again by the member of a priesthood and an order, and known to be committed by him, do not prevent him from receiving promotion to lucrative and high offices, and responsible and spiritual cures, there that class of offences is not regarded substantially as being weighty and heinous. Whether this arises from defective appreciation of the sin itself, or from an indulgence to the peculiar circumstances and temptations of the offender, or from both, the result which is forced upon us is the same—viz. that the sin is substantially not thought much of; that it is regarded as a slip, a peccadillo, not as a serious sin. We do not say that this is the view of the stricter minds, but that it is the view of those who practically represent and adminster the system. And for such a view we see some causes in operation in the Roman system, very deserving of attention, if we desire an explanation of that state of things which the recent trial before the Queen's Bench has placed before us.

The question of celibacy, its merits and its advantages, as compared with those of married life, is too delicate and large a one to be entered upon incidentally and suddenly. But one observation relating to this question shall be made, because it has a very special and direct bearing upon the particular case before us. The observation we shall make, relates to the temper, age, and circumstances in which such a state should be embraced, if it is embraced at all, and the source from which we shall draw it will be the text of Scripture itself. The passages of Scripture directly bearing on the question of celibacy, are, we need not say, few: they are mainly two, one in the 19th chapter of S. Matthew, and one in the 7th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. The language in the former passage is this—'All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is 'given . . . He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.' The language of the latter is, 'I would that all men were even as

Digitized by Google

'I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one 'after this manner, and another after that. . . . Concerning 'virgins I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my 'judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be 'faithful. I suppose therefore that this is good for the present 'distress, I say, that it is good for a man so to be. . . . He that 'is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, 'how he may please the Lord: but he that is married careth 'for the things that are of the world, how he may please his 'wife. . . . And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may 'cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that 'ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction. . . . He that 'standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath 'power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart to 'keep his virgin, doeth well.' Now these passages speak first of the unmarried state itself, and secondly, of the qualification for entering into and embracing it. The unmarried state is spoken of as in itself a superior state to the married, and possessing greater advantages for spiritual improvement and the worship of God. The qualification for embracing this state, is the possession of a particular gift of God—a gift not given to all, but only to a select number. And the sign of the possession of this gift is described as a certain state and temper of mind, a strength and resolution, of which the individual himself is conscious, and at the consciousness of which he arrives after serious and sober examination of himself. No language could describe more strongly than S. Paul's, the solid proof which a man ought to have of his capacities, and the search he ought to have instituted into his own heart, before he ventures upon such a trial. He must be as sure as the nature of such proof allows, that he is steadfast in his heart, has no necessity, hath power over his own will, hath decreed in his heart. These are forcible words. It would be ridiculous to suppose that mere boys could look so searchingly into their own hearts, and attain such a knowledge of themselves. Self-knowledge is not so early an acquisition. Such a search obviously implies that the person making it has arrived at full years of discretion, and is of mature understanding; that he is able to doubt himself, to mistrust temporary emotion, and wait for more solid symptoms. Certain powers and a certain temper, a coolness, a sobriety, a due mistrust, which manhood alone possesses, are implied.

But what is the practice of the Roman Church on this subject? Are not whole masses admitted into the profession of celibacy, before they can possibly know anything about their own strength or weakness? Are not crowds of mere boys systematically driven into it, before their tender unformed minds can have

Digitized by Google

ever directed one real look into themselves? The Council of Trent lays down the age of sixteen as a sufficiently mature one for a *profession*, or the inexorable taking of a vow of celibacy. Now, will any impartial sensible man, who is acquainted with the facts of mental growth, and has observed at what time the human being arrives at maturity,—will any father of a family, any tutor, come forward and declare that he thinks a youth of sixteen is able solidly to acquaint himself with his own capacities, and carry on a cool and grave search into himself?—that he is able to arrive upon satisfactory data at the sober conviction that he is steadfast in his heart, has no necessity, hath power over his own will? can he be reasonably certain of the decrees of his own heart? Is it then according to the rule of Scripture that a youth should, at the age of sixteen, be sent into this state, and placed in a situation of peculiar temptation without the power of withdrawing from it, for the rest of his life? But the assignment of a regular profession, or taking of the vow, to the age of sixteen, only affects the act of profession itself, and therefore only guards the formal and technical entrance into the state of celibacy. Under the Roman system, the youth is practically handed over to that state long before he is formally admitted to it. He is put at a very early age, while a mere child, into a train which ultimately carries him to the act of profession, a result which he cannot prevent, unless he is endowed with an independence and power of mind which children have not, nor indeed ought to have. How is a mere child to be expected to oppose the designs of his parents, who bring him up to be a priest or a monk as a mode of livelihood? How can he possibly lift himself out of the circumstances which surround and control him? He must take what line of education is offered him, or have no education at all. How can he be expected to know, or to think of, the result at all, or find out his objection in the first instance? As a matter of course he finds himself in a train of education for being a monk; as a matter of course he takes the vows when he is told to do so. It may be proper to add, that the assumption of 'the religious habit,' which is an incipient act of profession, though not attended by the vow, is allowed by the Council of Trent to take place, in the case of girls, at the age of twelve; and that this permission is construed by many, as Thomassinus informs us, to extend to children of the other sex as well. We have no means at present of ascertaining what is the practice of the Church of Rome in this respect, nor is the distinction one of much importance. Practically the religious habit is imposed, when the boy is put into a regular train of education for being a monk. The Council of Trent may lay down formal rules against enforcing

Digitized by Google

or enticing children, but can such rules prevent the natural working of a system? Can they prevent friends and relations, at the persuasion of the priest, or as a means of getting a burden off their hands, or for the more creditable object of securing a provision for the child himself, putting the child into training for the monastic life; and can they make the child know of the existence of such rules, or give him the power to take advantage of them? It is ludicrous to suppose that they can. These rules, then, exist on paper; they are very convenient to refer to and parade when a charge is brought; but it is a mockery of common sense to pretend that they can be any solid safeguard against the exertion of a complete practical control over a child, in the matter of choosing this profession of life for him. Indeed it must be observed, that the principal authorities of the Roman Church hardly disclaim this result, or rather positively approve of it. The whole discussion in Thomassinus implies that it is a very good thing to dedicate children from the earliest years to a monastic life; and eminent casuists, of whom one, Medina, was himself present at the Council of Trent, interpret the restrictions of the Council in favour of allowing not only a parental dedication of children, but the reception of them within the monastic walls themselves, before the age of reason; though it is allowed that a licence from Rome is necessary in this case. It is admitted indeed by these casuists that children are no longer *obliged* now, as they were in the middle ages, by the laws of Church or State, to ratify the parental dedication by taking the vows themselves, but they add that they ought, and would be expected so to do.

The prevailing sentiment, then, in the Roman Church, is in favour of beginning the monastic life in childhood before the age of reason. Under the influence of this general idea children are brought up and put into training for that life, while they are no more than children. And finally, the inexorable vow is taken by them at an age when, if they are no longer children, they are certainly not men,—at the boyish age of sixteen.

The practical treatment of this subject by the Church of Rome, thus — independently of the question of vows, which is a distinct question, and into which we do not here enter— expressly contradicts the treatment of it in Scripture; and whereas Scripture describes the qualification for the state of celibacy as a special gift of God, not given to all; in Roman practice, on the contrary, it is regarded simply as a power, which any Christian whatever has; and its possession is counted on in the case of any chance person, picked up out of the mass, with the same confidence with which the ordinary faculties, moral and intellectual, are counted on. It is treated

as a mere matter of education, as if youth could be brought by education to the true celibate frame, just as they are brought by education to the power of reading and writing. It is quite true, that up to a certain point, we have the full right to reckon up an individual's possession of moral and religious powers; and it is that right which justifies us in bringing up any man whatever to be a Christian, notwithstanding the trials and responsibilities of the Christian state. But those moral and religious powers which we have a right to reckon on, are those which enable a man to lead an ordinary Christian life, and those only. We know that to every baptized person these powers are guaranteed, and therefore we have a right to educate any baptized person for the ordinary Christian trial. The case is altered when the trial which is contemplated is an extraordinary one, and when no guarantee exists for powers and gifts capable of surmounting it. If we commit any chance person to such a trial, we do it upon our own responsibility, notwithstanding any training which we may give him; and if he fails, and falls into greater sin thereby, we share his guilt. But the Roman Church does commit chance persons to this extraordinary trial. She commits them to it at an age, when she cannot possibly know whether they have the special gift or not. The Gospel treats the trial as one for individuals here and there to encounter, she regards it as a trial for the mass; for a chance pick out of the mass is on the same level with the mass. The Gospel prescribes to the individual a searching examination of himself, in order to ascertain the presence of this gift; the Roman Church practically requires no self-examination at all, for she commits him irrevocably to the trial, before he has the power to make it.

But we shall be told, that we do not calculate sufficiently on the grace of the new dispensation, and the powers of a renewed nature. We hear somebody saying,—You talk like a pagan. This trial is indeed too difficult for the natural man, but the Holy Spirit enables the members of the Church to meet this, and much greater. We have already answered this plea. We can know no more about the grace of the new dispensation and its operation in members of the Church, than what the Bible tells us. And the Bible expressly says, that this grace does not include the gift in question; this gift being a special one, given to some, and not to other members of the Church.

Now observe the natural results of a system which thus contradicts the rule and counsel of Scripture on this subject. The first result is, that many fail in the trial to which they are so unwarrantably exposed. The next is, that discipline is obliged to relax, and lower its estimate of the sin. Too many fall, to

Digitized by Google

enable ecclesiastical authority to exercise primitive severity toward the offenders; for the standard which the Court takes must always depend considerably on the practice of the people. The law cannot afford to have too many transgressors, and must shut its eyes. From connivance to promotion the step is short. The man's formal position is not touched; his own ambition, his serviceableness to the body, his talents, eloquence, knowledge, if he possesses them, remain. He is made use of for carrying on the system, and the system gives him his wages.

Such is the picture which the late trial before the Queen's Bench has placed before our eyes. It is very hard to suppose, judging by ordinary rules, that the long toleration and promotion of a man, known to have the character which Achilli had, could have gone on, if that class of offences had not lost, in the priestly and monastic order, that rarity which keeps up the standard of their guilt. Imagine it to be a rare, a most extraordinary thing for a cleric to commit such a crime: and that one day it is discovered that a particular cleric has plunged into the deepest crimes of this sort: would there not be something unaccountable in the immediate promotion of such a man to preside over ecclesiastical seminaries, and preach Lent sermons? The converse then approves itself, and is required to satisfy that want which we feel, as rational creatures, for some consistent account of the facts which come before us. He was promoted, because the estimate of his offence was not a high one: and the estimate was not high, because the offence itself was not sufficiently rare. A whole state of things is before us, which is perfectly intelligible upon this supposition, but which without it is not intelligible.

It is true, cases like that of Achilli do not turn up every day. But we cannot argue from the fact that they do not come out, to the fact that they do not happen. Should we, for example, but for the single circumstance that Achilli had turned Protestant, have ever heard one single word of the enormities of this particular person, Achilli? To us it appears very evident we should not. They would have been inscribed in the register of the Episcopal Court of Viterbo, in the register of the Holy Office at Rome; they would have occupied the reports of the police: but the registers of Italian Church Courts, and the reports of Italian police are not public documents. Who in this country would have been a bit the wiser for information contained in these occult rolls of parchment and secret ledgers? Achilli was in bad odour again in society; but the bad odour which surrounds a man is after all often a very limited one. A particular circle knows certain things against him; but out of this circle these facts do not transpire. By cases of immorality

Digitized by Google

coming out, we mean their coming out so as to be known to the world at large;—those of Achilli would have never come out in this sense, would never have reached Protestant ears, had he not turned Protestant. Then, Viterbo, Rome, Capua, Naples, which had been all so silent hitherto, could speak out; the police could supply, upon solicitation, useful extracts from their black book to appear in our contemporary, the 'Dublin.' The bad odour in which Achilli had lived could then be wafted across the sea. The Holy Office could send a voice from its caverns, and anybody and everybody that knew anything against the heretic could communicate it to the English press. But where was all this information before? Where it would have remained for ever after, had not Achilli become a convert,—in the confinement of official parchment, and the narrow circle of towns-talk? We cannot argue then from the fact that such cases do not come out and reach Protestant ears, to the fact that they do not occur. Of course, such cases are kept snug, are confined to the friendly knowledge of members of the communion. It is not to be expected that one religion should communicate its own scandals for the triumph of another. We observe in the evidence of some of the witnesses at the recent trial, sufficient proof of a systematic concealment of priestly scandals. A witness on being asked by the counsel whether she had told her own mother of her fall, replies, 'No, because the Confessor forbade my mentioning it, as Achilli was an ecclesiastic.' The concealment was used toward her own dearest and nearest relation; and the reason for it was not natural shame and remorse, but the religious duty of hiding the immorality of a priest. And where such a course is urged by a Priesthood as a religious duty upon the people, it is not difficult to guess on what a large scale concealment may take place. A double wall of concealment thus hides the misdemeanours of the priestly body from the eyes of the world at large. There is a cover at the fountain-head, and if they penetrate through this, they only ordinarily find their way into an inner and home circle of ears—a local sphere, the scandal of which never reaches the great world. But individual cases may let out a whole state of things.

There is only one answer we can think of to these observations, viz. that immorality in priests alienates them in heart from their own communion, and leads to their conversion to Protestantism; so that the fact which occasions the publication of such crimes, and therefore the publication itself, is coextensive with their occurrence. But will the assertion be seriously made, that immorality and conversion do thus go together. If it is, all we can say is, that it does not deserve serious notice;

Digitized by Google

it is an assertion and no more; and it is in violent contradiction to numerous disclosures mediæval and modern.

Will it be objected that this is an invidious line of remark, and that we are wanting to make out as bad a case as possible for the Roman Church, and squeezing out by inference what we cannot obtain by regular evidence? We answer—Here is a case before us. We did not go to look for it; it has been obtruded upon our eyes; but coming as it does before us, we must and ought to have some view or other about it. It is no little matter: it is an important and weighty disclosure of some of the interior of a system of which we are generally obliged to be external spectators only; it is one of those large facts which support an argument. Nor does it by any means stand alone; but it is a type of a regular class of discoveries which time after time take place respecting the Roman system and its working. No one, indeed, can look at all the circumstances of Achilli's case, and really suppose it to be a single case.

We shall end with two cautions to the Romanist party, as regards their language about individuals, and about their own system; cautions which this whole discussion has very naturally suggested.

First, with respect to the individual Achilli, and such like offenders, our Romanist friends call them 'wolves.' They are very free in the use of this term: it is their account of them: they are 'wolves,' and that is all that is to be said. The Roman Catholic Editor of the Report before us appends to his labours a motto from S. Augustine:—'Let not the sheep discard their clothing, because the wolf sometimes conceals himself therein.' Now this is a true account in part, but it is only a part of the truth; and we shall not allow it to pass without supplying it with its proper complement. The wolf Achilli 'concealed himself in sheep's clothing:'—granted: but when did he conceal himself therein? At the age of seventeen. At that early age he took the inexorable vow, assumed the monastic habit, and committed himself once and for all to an extraordinary state of life, and extraordinary trials. Can the first step, then, and that is a most important one, in this career of concealment be properly called his own act? 'He put on,' says our contemporary, 'in 'innocent youth and with guileless heart, before God's altar, 'the holy habit, as the wedding garment of the Lamb.' But, in the name of Scripture and of reason, we ask, is 'innocent youth' the age at which such an ordeal should be imposed? Can 'an innocent youth' know himself and his own powers? can he search his own heart, and find if he is steadfast, has no necessity, has power over his own will, has effectively decreed in his own heart. Our contemporary describes with a sentimental glow the sup-

Digitized by Google

posed innocence, youth, and guilelessness of the commencing Achilli, in order that he may contrast it with the misery and guilt of the ultimate Achilli; but never was sentiment more displaced, and never did a contrast more recoil upon an arguer's head. S. Paul does not describe innocent, guileless, unsuspecting, inexperienced youth, when he describes what are the tests of being qualified for this state of life. No: he describes the inner working and self-sifting of a *man's*, a full-grown and mature man's mind. He had not before his mind, when he wrote that chapter, 'innocent youths,' committed when they could not help themselves, and when they could not know themselves, when they were little more than tools in the hands of those who controlled them to this extraordinary state of life and its unceasing ordeal. Talk of the 'wolf,' then, as much as you please; but what if the shepherds pulled in the wolf by the head and shoulders; what if, when the wolf had eaten two or three of the sheep, the shepherds gave him a comfortable kennel in the midst of the fold, 'in the hope of reclaiming him;' what if his reformation was under such circumstances slow, and he ate several more of the sheep: what if the shepherds, still bent upon a kindly reformation of the wolf, in order to melt and captivate him by an act of unqualified trust in his sincerity, send him on a commission to bring in some stray sheep; and what if the wolf concludes an affectionate appeal to these wanderers with a meal made out of some of them? In that case the fact is certainly too evident, that he is a wolf; but neither are you good shepherds. The good shepherd does not stand by while the wolf time after time devours the sheep, and reserve his indignation till the time when the wolf has taken it into his head to leap over the walls of the fold, and is off elsewhere—then, and not till then, when all the mischief has been done, and a controversial end is to be gained, with pious horror to shout, Oh, wolf! dreadful wolf! Follow the rule of the New Testament, then, we say to the Roman Catholics; cease to supply your monastic orders by entrapping 'innocent youths,' and committing them inexorably to trials, of their power to sustain which you can have no evidence; lay upon men's shoulders only such burdens as the Gospel authorizes you to lay, and lay these burdens upon the shoulders that are able to bear them, according to the best proof you can have of their strength. Do this, and then you may shout 'Wolf,' when the man fails in the trial. But do not, when you lay the burden upon unascertained strength, condemn the fallen man as a wolf, and free yourselves from all blame. Do not, when you, and not he, are the really responsible party for the undertaking of the trial, throw all the responsibility upon him when he fails in it. Do not,—when your own connivance has encouraged the repetition of

Digitized by Google

failure, till the fallen man has fallen much lower than he did at first,—throw the accumulation of blame entirely at his doors, as if you yourselves were no sharers in it. Do not do this, even in the case of the worst, the deepest criminals. Not even in the case of Achilli can we allow the breach of plain, simple justice, which is involved in parading, with the exulting precision of place and date, the catalogue of his sins, without one single thought on the premature committal of him to the trial. Never till that day comes, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest, can it be known whether a deep, an incalculable wrong was not done to this man by that act of his Church. It is easy, according to superficial notions of justice, to shove aside the case of such a man, as if he could have no rights and no wrongers, and because he is now a criminal had always been an outlaw. But no one can possibly tell how far his first offence originated in his having had a, to him, unduly hard trial put upon him; how far the succeeding offences were consequences of the first, and therefore how far the whole ultimate accumulation of guilt may fall back step by step upon the original act of his Church, though not, of course, to the relief of himself from responsibility. This is a mysterious subject. All we know is that a course of sin when once begun has very soon the effect of hardening the mind, and that the beginning of sin may be a trial which ought not to have been placed upon a man. We cannot cut this matter short by saying,—The man had freewill, therefore he could have avoided the sin, therefore he was not wronged by the trial. Scripture has a larger and more complex mode of treating this subject. It treats man certainly as having freewill, but the sort of freewill which it describes is a mystery, and not a single definite power cognizable by the understanding. It is clear from Scripture that such freewill as the Gospel secures to us, is not a power of doing anything whatever of a moral or spiritual kind; because Scripture says expressly, that a man may have one gift or spiritual power, and not have another. But though it is as clear as the day that this is the view of Scripture, and though it is sufficiently clear that, if it is, Achilli was wronged in having a trial imposed upon him at an age when he could not know whether he had the corresponding gift,—not once has it occurred to the controversialists of the Roman Church to acknowledge this wrong. Yet, if a clear wrong has been done to a man, even though it be one single one, and though he himself be the vilest criminal under the sun, that wrong ought to be acknowledged; especially if it was done at a critical and telling time. Dr. Newman may say, You, Achilli, are the scandal of the Roman Church: but how can we possibly know, whether Achilli may not say with truth—yes,

Digitized by Google

and with a truth which, in spite of, nay, rather in consequence of his very sins, will be recorded in the Divine register,—You, the Church of Rome, have been an offence unto me. The Roman controversialists had, indeed, a clear right to remind Achilli that he had disqualified himself by his crimes for appearing as a witness and preacher against the Roman Church. But that right ought to have been exerted with forbearance, and under the check of the consciousness that Achilli himself had his ground of complaint, and a real one against Rome. But so far from being conscious of any wrong on their side, or being checked by it, they have, on the contrary, with the blindness of men who can see no fault in the system to which they belong, taken especial pains to urge that very point, that the vow taken at the age of seventeen did include the state of celibacy, to urge it—will it be believed?—as against Achilli, and for themselves. They have been possessed with the spirit of folly to that degree, that they have mistaken a clear argument against them for an argument in their favour, and have called the special attention of the whole world to this injustice in their system. At the late trial before the Queen's Bench, the counsel of the defendant was instructed to fix upon the vow which Achilli took at the age of seventeen, the special interpretation of a vow of celibacy. The unfortunate man himself, indeed, endeavoured to evade the force of the vow, on what principle, we confess, we are unable to see, except on the general one of denying all acts whatever that were charged upon him by the opposite side. But a witness on his own side expressly fixes this meaning upon the vow.

'Dominico Pogge, formerly a Dominican monk, now principal of a Protestant educational establishment at Seacombe, near Liverpool, cross-examined by Sir A. Cockburn: "You were one of the Fathers?" "Yes." "What vows did you take?" "I took the vow of obedience as a Dominican, but always thought, that though not explicitly, implicitly those of 'poverty' and 'chastity' were included. The book of Ferraris is one of authority, but there are things in it which have become obsolete." "But this is an edition of 1783, and it states, *Tria vota, paupertatis, castitatis, et obedientiæ, sunt essentiæ religionis ex jure divino.* Now is this so; that the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, are of the essence of the religious life?" "All that is perfectly true, according to the belief of the Church of Rome." "So that it would be an essential part of the vow taken by a Dominican, to obey the injunction of chastity?" "Certainly."'

The other caution which we shall give to our Romanist friends, is one on which the limits of this article will not allow us to enlarge. But we will give it in two words. It relates to their language respecting their system. Do not boast too much of the effectiveness of your system. Undoubtedly it is effective. But how is that effectiveness obtained? Is it not at the cost of a clear violation of the rule of the New Testament—that rule

Digitized by Google

which only echoes after all the voice of reason, the instincts of charity,—that no one should be committed to extraordinary trials before his strength can be ascertained? What gives your Church its effectiveness, is your system of celibacy. That system supplies you with a powerful and disposable force. But is not your practical system, nay, your formal system, as set forth by your authorities on this question of celibacy, at variance with the plain recommendations of Scripture? Do you practically regard Scripture as inspired on this question, or rather, do not you take a line of your own, quite independent of whatever Scripture may say? If so, the effectiveness of your system is not after all so enviable a one; there is a blot upon it which it cannot wipe off. When you boast of your effectiveness, your antagonists have only to go to the New Testament. They see there, as plain as words can speak, a whole different view of this question of celibacy, to that of your Church. They can feel confident that under whatever obstacles their own system may labour, it is not all right with yours. You look to effectiveness, as if that were the one object which a Christian Church ought to aim at, and as if there were no rules, no limits laid down, in Scripture or reason, by which this aim should be modified. So long as you can get your force up, whether by conscription or by guile, by whatever recruiting arts, you care not; the result is obtained: your force is collected; your system is effective. You are quite satisfied; you boast; you call the attention of the world to your success. You say—Look at us, how strong we are, how effective we are. What is the natural result of this system, proceeding upon human ideas which have thrown off the check of Scripture? Tremendous scandal. Shocking disclosures from time to time take place, which show what the interior working of such a system, in a greater or less degree, always is. What then is your reply? Oh, these scandals are necessary: we must run the risk of them, if we are to have an *effective* system. But who told you of any Divine command to be effective at all risks? We never heard of one. There is no such command. You have invented it. We allow then the effectiveness of your system, and while we allow it, we do not grudge it you too much. We think the first command to be attended to, is the commandment of charity, the rule of the Gospel. We are ready to allow that our own shortcomings may be owing to other and not so good reasons; but so far as the observance of that rule takes away from the effectiveness of our system, it is not a weakness to be ashamed of.

Digitized by Google

ART. VI.—*The Study of Words. By the Rev.* R. CHENEVIX TRENCH, B.D. London: John W. Parker.

THERE is no test by which to measure a man's state of thought, education, and intellect, so accurate as his choice of words. It may, indeed, be only a truism to assert this; but, at least, it is a truism not enough in men's thoughts, and not used as it might be as a safeguard against pretenders and shallow thinkers. For most men, if they would exert their powers of discrimination, are judges of a clear address, and are alive to the charm of nicely fitting words, well adjusted to the thought they clothe. Accurate thinkers cannot talk—much less write—in a slovenly fashion. Loose talkers cannot be accurate thinkers, and we may well mistrust the reasoner who would turn us from an established train of thought if we can detect in his own line of persuasions terms applied at random, and arguments set forth in a vague and uncertain phraseology.

That man ought to inspire no confidence who uses his words without weighing them, who attaches to them different meanings as suits his purpose, and who is so little alive to his own inaccuracies that he takes for granted his hearer follows him in all his changes, and accepts every term in the sense in which he uses it: showing himself to have no fixed unchangeable definitions in his mind, no other idea of the meaning of words than that which he assigns to them at the moment, and remaining all the while blind to the confusion and mistiness of thought, which this habit propagates and engenders. And yet how many talkers, preachers, and writers might be thus described who have made some figure in the world; how many unprofitable disputes have arisen and been maintained, at the expense of truth and charity, solely by the zealous efforts of this band of vague and yet positive thinkers!

But, happily, all inaccurate talkers do not think it necessary to give wide circulation to their errors. Our concern, taking up the subject from the volume before us, is rather with the mass of mankind who are content to talk well or ill to their own immediate circle. And whatever sphere this is, a man shows by his choice of words what fruit he has gained from the experience and education which have fallen to his share. Man's first use of language, like the first life of language itself, is of its literal simple phrases, perfectly expressive of plain wants and simple thoughts. Conscience keeps him, it may be, tolerably clear, in his apprehension of the first abstractions that come in his way,

Digitized by Google

helping him to a notion of 'good' and 'bad' apart from his nurse's definition; but in process of time he finds himself in possession of a large vocabulary, the offspring of the world's thought, wisdom, and genius, which, as he avails himself of it, may, either guide him to the comprehension of the deepest, purest truths;—the very words themselves, if duly weighed, so many trains of thought worked ready to his hands, facilitating study and clearing the mind for still further attainments:—or, if adopted without reflection, simply lead him astray into regions beyond his powers: the habit which he thus acquires of misapplying the most delicate vehicles of thought with all their infinite shades of meaning only plunging him into deeper confusion of ideas, while at the same time it beguiles him into vanity, rash assertion, and the whole train of evils which follow upon the use of high-sounding words to which the mind cannot give substance. Avoiding this error, and still shrinking from the labour of thought, he may indeed confine himself all his days, though not by a conscious exercise of choice, to the circumscribed range of terms and symbols which satisfied his childhood, or which are forced upon him by his calling in life; but this paucity of words betrays the absence or total neglect of the higher powers of the intellect, which cannot grow without words to embody them. The man without a clear comprehension of the words he uses, and a tolerably full vocabulary, is in no proper sense educated or formed. He can neither think deeply, nor express himself forcibly, nor converse accurately, nor appeal effectually to the reason of others, nor touch their feelings. For all this, correct and expressive language is absolutely necessary: even religion must be invested with true and powerful words to be duly apprehended; while all acknowledge its influence in enlarging, refining, and elevating the language of those who have had no other teacher, so that, when roused by the occasion, the ignorant can be eloquent, and having learned sacred truths through divine words, can apply those words with convincing force and propriety.

A careful study of words, then, is one of the main helps that education can give to the intellect, and no intellect, however clear, can work without this training. For though a good understanding, unaided by formal instruction, can arrive at an accurate comprehension of that branch of language which comes within nearest reach and most familiar practice, and can use it with powerful effect, no penetration can of itself give clear insight into terms beyond this range; therefore, the deepest thinkers are always most anxious to impress upon others—not the ignorant and thoughtless only, but their most enlightened readers—the necessity of study and agreement upon the terms and

Digitized by Google

words to be used in the subject on which they are entering. Keenly discriminating themselves—feeling the force of every slight deviation of meaning—none are so alive to the danger others run of separating words from the ideas connected with them, and of the magnitude of the evils which may result from any confusion on this point. 'Although,' says Bacon, 'we think 'we govern our words, yet certain it is that words, as a Tartar's 'bow, do shoot back upon the understanding of the wisest, and 'mightily entangle and pervert the judgment; so as it is almost 'necessary in all controversies and disputations to imitate the 'wisdom of the mathematicians in setting down in the very 'beginning the definitions of the words and terms, that others 'may know how we accept and understand them, and whether 'they concur with us or no. For it cometh to pass for want of 'this, that we are sure to end there where we ought to have 'begun, which is in questions and differences about words.' In another place, drawing from the reflection of the inability of men to comprehend accurately, and in the same sense, many of the words they use,—originated, as these words were, by the higher class of intellects for subtle and delicate uses above the discrimination of the vulgar,—the following charitable and consolatory inference: 'A man that is of judgment and understanding shall 'sometimes hear ignorant men differ, and know well within 'himself that those who so differ mean the same thing, and yet 'they themselves would never agree; and yet if it come so to 'pass in that distance of judgment which is between man and 'man, shall not we think that God above, that knows the hearts, 'doth not discern that frail men in some of their contradictions 'intend the same thing, and accepted both?'

South, after a masterly definition of what words ought to be, falls into an opposite strain from the dispassionate philosopher, and one more congenial to his caustic humour, showing the mischief which unavoidably follows from the misapplication or confusion of them. 'The generality of mankind is wholly and 'absolutely governed by words and names, without, nay, for the 'most part, even against the knowledge men have of things. 'The multitude, or common rout, like a drove of sheep or an 'herd of oxen, may be managed by any noise or cry which their 'drivers shall accustom them to. . . . As for the meaning of the 'word itself, that may shift for itself; and as for the sense and 'reason of it, that has little or nothing to do here; only let it 'sound full and round, and chime right to the humour which 'is at present agog (just as a big long rattling name is said 'to command even adoration from a Spaniard), and no doubt, 'with this powerful senseless engine the rabble-driver shall be 'able to carry all before him, or to draw all after him, as h

'pleases; for a plausible insignificant word in the mouth of an 'expert demagogue is a dangerous and dreadful weapon.'

To the same purport, but in graver language, Mr. Trench quotes Hooker as saying, 'The mixture of those things by speech which by nature are divided is the mother of all error.' Locke has devoted two chapters to the abuse of words, and the evil of using them without distinct ideas, or of applying them sometimes to signify one idea and sometimes another. 'A defi-'nition,' he says, 'is the only way whereby the precise mean-'ing of moral words can be known.' And the study which is here demanded for the right comprehension of questions in morals and philosophy is by masters of style held as essential to a proper enjoyment of works of fancy and imagination. Addison holds that a man cannot enter into a good metaphoric description without previous accurate knowledge of language; 'For, to have a true relish and form a right judgment of a 'description, a man should be born with a good imagination, 'and must have well weighed the force and energy that lie in 'the several words of a language, so as to be able to distinguish 'which are most expressive and significant to their proper ideas, 'and what additional strength and beauty they are capable of 'receiving from conjunction with others. The fancy must be 'warm to retain the print of those images it hath received from 'outward objects, and the judgment discerning to know what 'expressions are most proper to clothe and adorn them to the 'best advantage. A man who is deficient in either of these 'respects, though he may receive the general notion of a descrip-'tion, can never see distinctly all its particular beauties; as a 'person with a weak sight may have the confused prospect of a 'palace that lies before him without entering into its several 'parts, or discerning the variety of its colours in their full glory 'and perfection.'

It is for want of this careful self-cultivation that the reading of men in general does them so little good—affects them so little one way or another. It is because they see things and receive ideas in the dim misty way here described; because they have no powers of discrimination to exercise, no nice judgment to be satisfied, no taste by which to measure the efforts of others, and are mainly influenced in the absence of these more healthful impulses by a vague curiosity and a desire to be amused; content to be startled, diverted, horrified, by means which they do not analyse, and to the nature of which they are indifferent. Mr. Trench has done good service to literature as well as to morals, by his very interesting little volume bearing on this subject, and addressed ultimately, through his original hearers, to the class in whom want of thought and choice in their reading

Digitized by Google

is most excusable, as being a subject on which too little has hitherto been taught them, and with whom the pressure of other pursuits tells against hard reading of any kind. The present volume on 'The Study of Words,' consists of six lectures, first read by Mr. Trench to the pupils of the Winchester training-school, and still bearing traces of oral delivery, in some inaccuracies of style, but composed on so simple and popular a plan, as certainly to engage and sustain the attention of those readers not yet exercised in severer studies, for whom he designs them; while the most critical and experienced will find matter worthy of an attentive perusal. A popular work on this subject is a want supplied; and it was because Mr. Trench felt this want, that he has given his lectures a wider publicity, as he explains in his preface:—

'Had I known any book entering with any fulness, and in a popular manner, into the subject matter of these pages, and making it its exclusive theme, I might still have delivered these lectures, but should scarcely have sought for them a wider audience than their first, gladly leaving the matter in their hands, whose studies in languages had been fuller and riper than my own. But abundant and ready to hand as are the materials for such a book, I did not; while yet it seems to me that the subject is one to which it is beyond measure desirable that their attention who are teaching, or shall have hereafter to teach others, should be directed; so that they shall learn to regard language as one of the chiefest organs of their own education and that of others. For I am persuaded that I have used no exaggeration in saying, that in many a young man "his first discovery that words are living powers, has been like the dropping of scales from his eyes, like the acquiring of another sense, or his introduction into a new world;"—while yet all this may be indefinitely deferred, may, indeed, never find place at all, unless there is some one at hand to help him and to hasten the process; and he who so does will ever after be esteemed by him as one of his very foremost benefactors.'—*Preface*, p. iv.

It is certainly a great step gained, when the mind does think over the words it meets with or which it uses; and that truly deserves the term education which sets the thoughts naturally and without effort into this current. Making the mind not merely a recipient of facts, but competent to weigh and judge, apt at subtle distinctions, able to penetrate under the surface into the full meaning of what is presented to it. And Mr. Trench is right, that even to the very young this study might be made interesting—as there is no better test of a child's intellectual progress than its accurate use of the words at its command. 'And,' as he says to the future schoolmasters whom he is addressing,

'as you will not find, for so I venture to promise, that this study of words will be a dull one when you undertake it yourselves, as little need you fear that it will prove dull and unattractive when you seek to make your own gains herein the gains also of those who may be here after committed to your charge. Only try your pupils, and mark the kindling of

the eye, the lighting up of the countenance, the revival of the flagging attention, with which the humblest lecture upon words, and on the words especially which they are daily using, which are familiar to them in their play, or at their church, will be welcomed by them. There is a sense of reality about children, which makes them rejoice to discover that there is also a reality about words, that they are not merely arbitrary signs, but living powers; that, to reverse the words of one of England's "false prophets," they may be the fool's counters, but are the wise man's money; not like the sands of the sea, innumerable disconnected atoms, but growing out of roots, clustering in families, connecting and intertwining themselves with all that men have been doing and thinking and feeling, from the beginning of the world till now.'—P. 24.

This *fact*, perfectly understood, even before the mind can go any way towards proving it, is knowledge—and that best kind of knowledge which leads to thought and a respectful sense of other men's labours. The boy learns that there is something to be known even about the simplest and most familiar words, which all men do not know; and that a word could not be changed at random for one possessed of no history or derivation, without so far degrading the language and the speaker who uses it; of which the records of slang afford abundant evidence. A thought which may well lighten the task of acquiring a foreign tongue, assisting him, by some sense of the utility of his labours, through the many toilsome hours the acquisition of a dead language may cost him; which he is too often encouraged to consider waste of time, and the acquisition of barren words as opposed to living knowledge, not only by his own superficial questionings but by other superficial thinkers, who have neither his youth nor his weariness of his task as an excuse for the shallowness of the argument. It is something to realize that he cannot fully understand the meaning of his own tongue and the force of its terms without this labour, and that if all abandoned it, its history would fall into oblivion. Bearing on this subject, Mr. Trench has some good illustrations.

'But seek, I would further urge you, to attain a consciousness of the multitude of words which there are, that, now used only in a figurative sense, did yet originally rest on some fact of the outward world, vividly presenting itself to the imagination; a fact which the world has incorporated for ever, having become, as all words originally were, the indestructible vesture of thought. If I may judge from my own experience, I think there are few intelligent boys in your schools, who would not feel that they had gotten something, when you had shown them that to "insult" means properly to leap as on the prostrate body of a foe; "to affront," to strike him on the face; that "to succour" means to run and place oneself under one that is falling, and thus support and sustain him; to "relent," (connected with "lentus," not "lenis,") to slacken the swiftness of one's pursuit; "to reprehend," to lay hold of one with the intention of forcibly pulling him back from the way of his error; that to be "examined" means to be weighed. They would be pleased to learn that a man is called "supercilious" because haughtiness with contempt of others expresses

Digitized by Google

itself by the raising of the eyebrows or "supercilium;" that "subtle," (subtilis for subtexilis) is literally "fine-spun;" that "imbecile," which we use for weak, and now always for weak in intellect, means strictly, (unless indeed we must renounce this etymology,) leaning upon a staff, (in bacillo,) as one aged or infirm might do; that "chaste" is perfectly white, "castus" being a participle of "candeo," as it is now generally allowed; that "sincere" may be, I will not say that it is, without wax, (sine cerâ,) as the best and finest honey should be; that a "companion" is one with whom we share our bread, a messmate; that a "sarcasm" is, properly, such a lash inflicted by "the scourge of the tongue" as brings away the *flesh* after it; that "desultory," which, perhaps, they have been warned they should not be in their studies, but have never attached any very definite meaning to the warning, means properly leaping, as a rider in the circus does, from the back of one running horse to that of another, this rider being technically called a "desultor;" and the word being transferred from him to those who suddenly and abruptly change their courses of study.'—P. 196.

To this illustration of the moral use to be drawn from a knowledge of derivations, leading the youthful thinker ages back, to the first makers of the term, and to the vivid sense in which it must have been first applied, we shall add, though it comes in another connexion, the author's further lesson on the importance of an acquaintance with other languages, as furnishing the only storehouses for fresh words and further extensions of ideas: a vast benefit in the early days of our language, but not of much practical importance in the present time, and in the present stage of the English tongue, which, enriched as it has been from all the stores of dead and living languages, is an instrument now adapted to all the refinements and abstractions of thought. Believing it to have attained maturity, it should be our object rather to preserve it unimpaired, than to add to it without the most vigilant and jealous caution, and under urgent and acknowledged necessity.

'But to return to the more deliberate coining of words. This will often find place for the supplying of discovered deficiencies in a language. The manner in which men most often become aware of such deficiencies is, through the comparison of their own language with another, and a richer; a comparison which is forced upon them, so that they cannot put it by, when it becomes necessary for them to express in their own tongue that which has already found utterance in another, and so has at any rate shown that it is utterable in human speech. Without such a comparison, the existence of the want would probably have seldom dawned even on the most thoughtful. For language is to so great an extent the condition and limit of thought—men are so little accustomed, indeed so little able, to meditate on things, except through the intervention, and by the machinery of words, that nothing short of this would bring them to a sense of the actual existence of any such want; and it is, I may observe, one of the advantages of acquaintance with another language besides our own, and of the institution which will follow, if we have learned that other to any purpose, of these comparisons, that we thus come to be aware that names are not, least of all the names which any single language possesses, coextensive with things, (and by "things," I mean subjects as well as objects of thought, whatever one can *think* about,) that a multitude of things exist,

Digitized by Google

which, though capable of being resumed in a word, are yet without one, unnamed and unregistered; so that, vast as is the world of names, the world of realities is even vaster still. Such discoveries the Romans made when they attempted to transplant the moral philosophy of Greece to an Italian soil; they found that many of its words had no equivalents in their own tongue, which equivalents therefore they proceeded with more or less success to devise for themselves, appealing with this view to the latent capacities of their own tongue. For example, the Greek schools had a word, and one playing no unimportant part in some of their systems, to express apathy on the absence of all passion and pain. As it was absolutely necessary to possess a corresponding word, Cicero invented "indolentia," as the "if I may so speak," with which he paves the way to his first introduction of it, manifestly declares.'—P. 111.

In spite of our acknowledged obligations to the past, in spite of the fact, that unless there had been inventors and innovators in old times, who boldly ventured to intrude a new sound on men's ears, without which we of the present day should find ourselves sadly straitened in our vocabulary, we yet think there is no point in which it is so natural to be conservative, and, as we have said, jealous of any change whatever, as in words. We fully acquiesce in the opinion of Ben Jonson, partly excepted against by Mr. Trench, that 'a man coins not a new 'word without some peril, and less fruit; for if it happen to be 'received, the praise is but moderate; if refused, the scorn is 'assured.' It is a sentiment at least which every age will make more true.

Words are a part of ourselves: they are the dress of our minds: and as he is seldom the wisest man who makes the first change in the fashion of his garments, though others may be led afterwards to adopt his invention; so the coiners of new words, and those who are eager to take up and patronise the novelty, must bear the charge of fancifulness and even affectation, unless they have some stringent necessity to plead for the innovation. There is a paper in 'The Spectator' on this subject, upon the introduction of French military terms, complaining that the newspapers, in describing our victories, used so many dark expressions, 'reconnoitre,' 'carte blanche,' 'Gasconade,' &c. that many a prudent citizen, after having read every article, had to inquire of his next neighbour what news the mail had brought.

Some prejudice we ourselves must own to the preacher who enjoins on us a *prayerful* spirit. Who does not a little question the school or else the cultivation of the man who commends his friend or his friend's book as *talented?* nor do we think the better of a person, who, in his zeal against that other new invention, '*shams*,' must talk of *actualities*, and such desperate attempts at being more real than reality itself. Though when once a word has gained any sort of footing, even if originally

Digitized by Google

open to graver objections, and of less respectable parentage, than the affectations we have adduced, its chances of spreading are so great, that each day ought to make us more lenient towards the users of it. We remember the time when the ladies of our acquaintance would have felt it as impossible to frame their lips to such words as—we pause ere we write them—*humbug* and *bore*, as to any word of undoubted impropriety; now, if the accent be but soft, and the pronunciation refined, we are forced to take in good part, what is meant in all simplicity. Men have incorporated these and similar words into the language, and being in their nature expressive, they will present themselves as the first representatives of ideas, and force themselves into society too good for them.

The question of synonyms, to which Mr. Trench devotes his fifth lecture, is one of more practical importance where a language has attained or approaches to maturity. We do not wish to increase our possessions where our territories are already so wide, but to ascertain the full value and resources of those we have. In an accurate feeling on this point lies indeed the difference between a loose and a forcible style; in the power of choosing, amongst many words or expressions which approximate to our meaning, the one which alone exactly expresses it; for if the idea or image is a distinct one, it is probable that there is only one perfect *best* way of saying it; though there may be a hundred which will tolerably represent it. 'Every word,' it has been said, 'is appropriate to some one idea or set of ideas, whose 'unaltered image that medium alone is formed precisely to 'transmit. The image conveyed through any other media 'would be dimmed, distorted, multiplied, magnified, or dimi-'nished, and the purpose of language not only frustrated but 'perverted.' This axiom enforced would make talking and writing a serious matter with most men. But any enforcement of the exact, definite, inalienable meaning of words brings us to the reflection how infinitely various are men's powers in this respect. We all are acquainted with some talkers, and very lengthy talkers too, whose words are no other than a sort of loose wrapper to their meaning — not from hypocrisy, but because they have (either through natural dimness of perception, or defective and narrow education, or the habit of unreflecting talk,) no real notion of the meaning of words; their conception is dressed up in fragments,—it has no garments of its own. We are left to guess what may be intended underneath, as through the coating of some cast or mould, which shows a distant uncouth resemblance of the image within, but no likeness. This, however, is an extreme case, though every one must know some one of whom such a description would not be over-

Digitized by Google

drawn; and all must be familiar with the fatigue and labour of mind which is the portion of the listener under such discourses. Ordinary talkers and writers can approach their meaning a little closer,—or, we should say, they have a more definable meaning,—but still such an one as may be as well expressed by a dozen different terms. They do not seek for accuracy, they have no desire for it: there is no necessity for one word more than another to give body to an image or a notion which is vague till determined by the form which chance rather than choice moulds it into. To such we can attend without effort, but their talk makes no impression—it is the average conversation of mankind. There are others who, having a vivid and distinct meaning and no physical hindrances to a free expression, say the thing they mean; their arrow hits the mark—we feel that no other words would have admitted us into their inner mind as clearly. Now these, whether they know it or not, whether it is the fruit of study or a happy intuition, are yet adepts at the finer arts of discrimination; they can distinguish with the skill of a philologist, though it may be unconsciously, the minute, delicate points of difference in terms that have a general resemblance, which pass in most minds for the same; they can choose words whose associations will bring the subjects home with liveliness and energy to our hearts. All judicious study of words must help towards the attainment of this art, so far at least as to secure against looseness and incorrectness of expression. Eloquence and felicity cannot be taught. Mr. Trench thus introduces this part of his subject after his first definition of the term:—

'Synonyms, then, as the word is generally understood, and as I shall use it here, are words with slighter differences already existing between them, or with the capabilities of such:—neither on the one side absolutely identical; but neither, we may add, on the other, only very remotely related to one another; for the differences between these last will be self-evident, will so lie on the surface and proclaim themselves to all, that it would be impossible to make them clearer than they already are, and it would be like holding a candle to the sun to attempt it. They must be words which are more or less liable to confusion, but which yet ought not to be confounded: words, as one has said, "quæ conjungi, non confundi, debent;" words in which there originally inhered a difference, or between which, though once absolutely identical, such has gradually grown up, and so established itself in the use of the best writers, and in the instinct of the best speakers of the tongue, that it claims to be recognised and openly admitted by all. But here an interesting question presents itself to us, which is this: How do languages come to possess synonyms of this latter class, which are differenced not by etymology or other deep-lying and necessary distinction, but only by usage? Now, if they had been made by agreement, of course no such words could exist; for when one word had been found which was the adequate representative of a feeling or an object, no further one would have been sought. But languages are the

Digitized by Google

result of processes very different from, and far less regular and formal than this. Various tribes, and each with its own dialect, kindred indeed, but in many respects distinct, coalesce into one people, and cast their contributions of language into the common stock.'—P. 143.

Thus we have supplied from these sources various terms originally of the same signification; but as a language grows and has need of expression for more complex ideas, these terms separate from one another, and are gradually applied to distinguish different degrees and shades of the same idea, and in course of time become confirmed in their new distinct uses. In illustration of this process, Mr. Taylor, in his book on English Synonyms, adduces the words 'to *recal*, to *repeal*, to *revoke*, to *call back*. To *recal* is English, to *repeal* is French (*rappeler*), and to *revoke* is Latin (*revocare*), for the same idea, to call back.' Our conversation is English; we *recal* our directions to servants and other family arrangements. Our laws are French; we *repeal* acts of parliament. Our oratory is Latin; we *revoke* a panegyric, a denunciation, a promise, or a threat. To repeal is legally, and to evoke solemnly, to recal. We recal things, we call back persons. Again, in the words to *uncover*, to *discover*, to *detect*: the first is Saxon, the second French, the third Latin, for the same action of removing the cover; but to uncover is merely to take off the covering; to *discover*, is to lay bare that which was covered; and to *detect*, is to lay bare that which was intended to be concealed. And Mr. Trench instances the words 'trick,' 'device,' 'finesse,' 'artifice,' and 'stragem,' as an example of the numerous sources from which we get similar words: *trick* being Saxon, *devisa* Italian, *finesse* French, *artificium* Latin, and *stratagema* Greek, all originally expressive of the same idea, but now invested with different shades of meaning.

But where the etymology and the source are the same, custom still assigns differences of meaning. Custom, it has been said, is law in the matter of words; etymology only the commentary, enabling us to ascertain more clearly what the law of custom is, which it is the synonymist's business to trace out. Take the various derivatives of *effect*: *effective*, *efficient*, *efficacious*, *effectual*; as ingeniously adduced by Mr. Taylor. Causes, which have usually a share in producing a given effect, are called *effective*; which have actually a share, are called *efficient*; which have a large share, are called *efficacious*; which have a decisive share, are called *effectual*. These differences arise from custom; in the following examples etymology is the guide: *distinction*, *diversity*, *difference*, *discrimination*: separation by the touch (*dis* and *tango*) makes a distinction; by turning apart (*dis* and *verto*) makes a diversity; by carrying asunder (*dis* and *fero*) makes a difference; by affixing a mark (*dis* and *crimen*) makes a

Digitized by Google

discrimination. Distinction is therefore applied to delicate variations; diversity, to glaring contrasts; difference, to hostile unlikeness; and discrimination, to formal criticism. Or again, in *attractions* and *allurements:* where attractions draw (*ad* and *trahere*), allurements beckon (*ad* and *leurrer*) towards the possessor; attractions are natural, and allurements are contrived, invitations. The attractions of beauty, the allurements of coquetry.

As examples are the great charm of this subject, we will give Mr. Trench's list of synonyms from different languages:—

'The two causes which I mentioned above,—the fact that English is, in the main, a compromise between the languages spoken by the Anglo-Saxon and the Norman, and the further circumstance that it has received, welcomed, and found place for many later additions, these have together effected that we possess in English a great many duplicates, not to speak of triplicates, or even such a quintuplicate as that which I adduced just now, where the Saxon, French, Italian, Latin, and Greek, had each given us a word. Let us mention a few duplicate substantives—Anglo-Saxon and Latin. Thus we have "shepherd" and "pastor," "feeling" and "sentiment," "hand-book" and "manual," "shire" and "county," "ship" and "nave," "anger" and "ire," "grief" and "dolour," "love" and "charity," "feather" and "plume," "forerunner" and "precursor," "freedom" and "liberty," "murder" and "homicide," "moons" and "lunes,"—a word which has not been met with in the singular. Sometimes, in theology and science especially, we have gone both to the Latin and to the Greek, and drawn the same word from them both; thus, "deist" and "theist," "numeration" and "arithmetic," "Revelation" and "Apocalypse," "temporal" and "chronical," "compassion" and "sympathy," "supposition" and "hypothesis."'—P. 149.

From nouns we pass on to verbs and adjectives, which each have many duplicates, as to 'heal,' to 'cure;' to 'soften,' to 'mollify;' 'almighty,' 'omnipotent;' 'shady,' 'umbrageous.' And examples follow of synonymous adjectives where the nouns have no synonyms, drawn from that list of adjectives given by Horne Tooke, where our language has adapted foreign adjectives to English nouns, as 'burdensome' and 'onerous,' 'priestly' and 'sacerdotal,' 'kingly' and 'regal,' 'bloody' and 'sanguine.' Though not to the point here, the fact is a curious one, how many of our Saxon nouns have no adjective derived from them, but are indebted for them to the Latin and French, as 'mouth,' which has 'oral;' 'side,' 'lateral;' 'word,' 'verbal;' 'being,' 'essential;' 'cat,' 'feline;' 'sun,' 'solar;' 'spring,' 'vernal;' 'end,' 'final;' 'money,' 'pecuniary;' 'thing,' 'real,' &c. But now to give Mr. Trench's distinctions, where we beg to dissent from his opinion of the present meaning of our word charity. The confounding of charity with alms-giving is a vulgar error rather than a received use. While the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians is read in our churches, this mistake cannot prevail; those who use 'charity' in a technical sense know that they do so.

'But to return; if we look closely at those other words which have succeeded in maintaining side by side their ground, we shall not fail to observe

that in almost every instance they have asserted for themselves separate spheres of meaning, that although not in etymology, they have still in use become more or less distinct. Thus we use "shepherd" almost always in its primary meaning, keeper of sheep; while "pastor" is exclusively used in the tropical sense, one that feeds the flock of God; at the same time the language having only the one adjective, "pastoral," that, of necessity, is common to both. "Love," "charity," are used in our authorized version of Scripture promiscuously, and out of the sense of their equivalence are made to represent one and the same Greek word; but in modern use, "charity" has come almost exclusively to signify one particular manifestation of love, the supply of the bodily needs of others; "love" continuing to express the affection of the soul. "Ship" remains in its literal meaning, while "nave" has become a symbolical term used in sacred architecture alone. So with "illegible" and "unreadable," the first is applied to the handwriting, and the second to the subject-matter written; thus, a man writes an illegible hand; he has published an unreadable book. So, too, it well becomes boys to be boyish, but not men to be "puerile,"' &c. —P. 152.

We must cut short our examples of the process of desynonymizing—a long word, which the wealth of our language has rendered necessary. One instance Mr. Trench gives of successful practice in this art, which is interesting. Until Wordsworth's day, though there was a sense of difference between the words 'imagination' and 'fancy,' yet they were continually confounded. The poet of our age has once and for ever assigned its peculiar place to each. Certain it is that so accurate a writer as Addison does confound them, as where, in his course of interesting papers on the Imagination, he says, 'By the pleasures 'of the imagination or fancy (which I shall use promiscuously) 'I here mean such as arise from visible objects,' &c. And again; 'Besides, the pleasures of the *imagination* have this advantage 'above those of the understanding, that they are more obvious 'and more easy to be acquired. It is but opening the eyes, and 'the scene enters; the colours paint themselves to the *fancy,*' &c. While Bacon, we are sorry to say, instead of nicely discriminating between the two, confounds both these faculties divine, with *lying;* only distinguishing between the lie of imagination and the lie of falsehood. 'The mixture of a lye,' he says, 'doth 'ever add pleasure. . . . One of the Fathers, in great severity, 'called poesy *vinum dæmonium,* because it filleth the imagina-'tion; and yet it is but with the shadow of a lye. But it is not 'the lye which passeth through the mind, but the lye that 'sinketh in, and settleth in it, that doth the hurt.'

Some good things on the moral value of synonyms are said, for which we have not space at length; in the distinctions, for instance, between *apprehend* and *comprehend,* as when we can apprehend truths which are yet above our comprehension; between 'opposite' and 'contrary,' where again it is possible to believe *opposite* truths but not contrary ones; and again between

Digitized by Google

'compulsion' and 'obligation,' 'discovery' and 'invention,' 'instruction' and 'education,' 'vengeance' and 'revenge.' The following words are ably discriminated, which are very generally used promiscuously:—

'Or consider the following words: "to hate," "to loathe," "to detest," "to abhor." Each of them rests on an image entirely distinct from the others; two, the first and second, being Anglo-Saxon, and the others Latin. "To hate," is properly to be *inflamed* with passionate dislike, the word being connected with "heat" and "hot;" just as we speak, using the same figure, of persons being "incensed" with anger, and of their anger "kindling;" "ira" and "uro" being perhaps related. "To loathe" is properly to feel nausea, the turning of the stomach at that which excites first natural, and then by a transfer, moral disgust. "To detest" is to bear witness against, not to be able to keep silence in regard to something, and to feel ourselves obliged to lift up our voice and testimony against it. "To abhor" is to shrink shuddering back, as one would from an object of fear, an hissing serpent rising in one's path. Our blessed Lord "hated" to see His Father's house profaned, when, the zeal of that house consuming Him, He drove forth in anger the profaners from it; He "loathed" the lukewarmness of the Laodiceans, when He threatened to spue them out of His mouth; He "detested" the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Scribes, when He proclaimed their sin, and uttered those eight woes against them; He "abhorred" the evil suggestions of Satan, when He bade the tempter to get behind Him, seeking to put a distance between Himself and him.'—P. 161.

The following nice distinction throws a new light on the value of the study of words, as an aid to the conscience, often perplexed between obedience to its demands, and what is due to society; by suggesting, as it does, a cautious etymological weighing of synonyms; where an acquaintance with the literal meanings of words may enable us to avoid exaggeration, and pay a compliment and speak truth at the same time. We could almost have wished Mr. Trench had pursued further the science of truthful good-breeding, and given us a conscientious form for 'not at home,' or for civilly and honestly accepting an unwelcome invitation.

'There is often a moral value in the possession of synonyms, enabling us, as they do, to say exactly what we intend, without exaggeration, or the putting of more into our words than we feel in our hearts, allowing us, as one has said, to be at once courteous and precise. Such moral advantage there is, for example, in the choice which we have between the words "to felicitate" and "to congratulate," for the expressing of our sentiments and wishes in regard of the good fortune that happens to others. To "felicitate" another, is to wish him happiness without affirming that his happiness is also ours. Thus out of that general goodwill with which we ought to regard all, we might "felicitate" one almost a stranger to us; nay more, I can honestly "felicitate" one on his appointment to a post, or attainment of honour, even though I may not consider him the fittest to have obtained it,—though I should have been glad if another had done so; I can desire and hope, that is, that it may bring all joy and happiness to him. But I could not, without a violation of truth, "congratulate" him, or that stranger whose prosperity awoke no lively delight in my heart;

Digitized by Google

for when I "congratulate" a person, (con gratulor,) I declare that I am sharer in his joy: that what has rejoiced him, has rejoiced also me. We have all, I daresay, felt, even without having made any such analysis of the distinction between the words, that "congratulate" is a far heartier word than "felicitate," and one with which it much better becomes us to welcome the good fortune of a friend; and the analysis, as you perceive, perfectly justifies the feeling. "Felicitations" are little better than compliments; "congratulations" are the expression of a genuine sympathy and joy.'—P. 165.

There is a spurious sort of synonyms which we would gladly see set down by those writers who can so nicely weigh the value and force of real ones; which are indeed better described as periphrastic sayings; those numerous methods, we mean, by which would-be wits and fine writers succeed in never 'calling a spade a spade.' It must have been synonyms of this order of which the Arabian writer spoke, when he gloried in his language containing fourscore words for honey, and a thousand for a sword, two hundred names for serpent, and five hundred for a lion. Some of these words, we will be bound to say, went considerably out of the way to convey the idea either of a sword or a lion, and he must have been no inconsiderable scholar who should know at once what object all the names meant; just such erudition is, by masters of this style, required of us. We should be glad to know how many names some historians have framed for the word 'king,' names infinitely perplexing to short memories and plain understandings, which have to keep up an exact knowledge of all the titles, moral qualities, and social relations of the king under discussion, without which the battle may be won, or the alliance contracted, and we not be made the wiser, because we can never get clearly to know who fought the one or engaged in the other. It is still worse with works of humour and fiction, where, often, the author cannot get along, far less his reader follow him, for the endless delays into which his fancy betrays him. The allusions are so continual as every moment to break the thread of the narrative, till in admiring his curious expedients for never calling a husband a husband, or a horse a horse, we lose all interest in what the husband or the horse is doing. We do not dispute that there are occasions when a thing is more vividly described by its accidents than its inherent qualities. It may once have given point to a description to say that such an one mounted his Rosinante, if it is of consequence that we should know the horse to have been a lean one, but the oftener we are called off from the rider to think of his horse—we wish the author to be assured—the less we shall care about the rider. Nothing is so irksome as continual interruption to the train of thought. Yet it is very true all the notion some writers have of wit is comprised in this perpetual misnaming. It has been well said

of these men, that they are like mountebanks,—they make a man a wit by putting on him a fantastic habit. This indeed is no new way of being clever, the old essayists complained of it in their day, and quote a distich from a poem, every line of which is a riddle, very much to our point, which we give as a less invidious example of our meaning than a modern instance might appear. The poem is describing a bonfire, in which—

> 'The Cynic's rolling tenement conspires
> With Bacchus his cast-coat to feed the fires.'

Certainly, says the commentator, the reader must consider twice or thrice before he will know the Cynic's tenement is a tub, and Bacchus his cast-coat, an empty hogshead. One merit, indeed, these enigmas possess over their modern successors,—they even now have an air of originality, whereas, the style we censure is the very essence of all that is trite and stale. Nothing ever seems said for the first time, and the mind, perplexed already, is still further tasked to recal where it has heard all this false humour before.

From the uses and abuses of a luxuriant vocabulary,—the gradual acquisition of a developing, progressing, discovering, reading, talking, thinking, reasoning, disputing, travelling community,—the transition is strange to those distant nations, or to those neglected portions of our own, with whom speech itself is being cut short—whose language is like an autumn tree, dropping its leaves, one by one, from failure of that sap of thought which should sustain them—who lose words by ceasing to use them, or to occupy themselves with the ideas of which they are the signs.

In his argument for the divine origin of language,—a direct gift from God to man at his creation,—as opposed to the infidel theory that the primitive condition of man was the savage one, Mr. Trench explains his view to be, not that man had his language ready formed to his hand in its fulness, but the structure of it; not the names of everything that met his eye or his reason, but the power of *naming* and of expressing the relation of things to each other. The language of the savage, so far from possessing this healthful power of growing and developing, shows—as all who analyse it bear witness—marks of decay; is evidently a ruin of something nobler and better than it is now, with traces still of cultivation, intelligence, and religion, which are rapidly becoming fewer and fainter. One by one, words expressive of abstract ideas or the usages of civilized life drop away, and with them departs the power of reviving the lost thought or humanizing custom, so that both the language and the habits of savage life must retrograde, till aided from without.

Digitized by Google

The following are interesting illustrations of the truth of this melancholy fact:—

'Moffat, in his *Missionary Labours and Scenes in South Africa*, gives us a very remarkable example of the disappearing of one of the most significant words from the language of a tribe sinking ever deeper in savagery; and with the disappearing of the word, of course, the disappearing as well of the great spiritual fact and truth whereof that word was at once the vehicle and guardian. The Bechuanas, a Caffre tribe, employed formerly the word "Morimo," to designate "Him that is above," or, "Him that is in heaven," and attached to the word the notion of a supreme Divine Being. This word, with the spiritual idea corresponding to it, Moffat found to have vanished from the language of the present generation, although here and there he could meet with an old man, scarcely one or two in a thousand, who remembered in his youth to have heard speak of "Morimo;" and this word, once so deeply significant, only survived now in the spells and charms of the so-called rain-makers and sorcerers, who misused it to designate a fabulous ghost, of whom they told the absurdest and most contradictory things. And as there is no such witness to the degradation of the savage as the brutal poverty of his language, so is there nothing that so effectually tends to keep him in the depths to which he has fallen. You cannot impart to any man more than the words which he understands either now contain, or can be made intelligibly to him, to contain. Language is as truly on one side the limit and restraint of thought, as on the other side that which feeds and unfolds it. Thus it is the ever-repeated complaint of the Missionary, that the very terms are wholly, or nearly wholly, wanting in the dialect of the savage, whereby to impart to him heavenly truths, or indeed, even the nobler emotions of the human heart. Dobrizhoffer, the Jesuit Missionary, in his curious *History of the Abipones*, tells us that neither they nor the Guarinies, two of the principal native tribes of Brazil, possessed any word in the least corresponding to our "thanks." But what wonder, if the feeling of gratitude was entirely absent from their hearts, that they should not have possessed the corresponding word in their vocabularies? Nay, how should they have had it there? And that this is the true explanation is plain, from a fact which the same writer records, that although inveterate askers, they never showed the slightest sense of obligation or of gratitude, when they obtained what they sought; never saying more than, "This will be useful to me," or, "This is what I wanted."'—P. 18.

Another cause for the decay of this language is given by Dobrizhoffer, not bearing on our author's argument, but curious in itself, and illustrative of the way in which uncivilized dialects may change and lose themselves; perplexing and confounding all inquiry into their source. These Abipones, and other kindred tribes speaking originally the same language, had the custom of abolishing the name of every one who died. Thus, as every one took his name from some visible object, a new name for this object must necessarily be substituted for the old one. These new titles being, it may be supposed, arbitrary, and not spreading beyond the use or knowledge of the tribe itself, it is easy to understand how soon languages originally alike, must lose all other resemblance but that of construction. Whether these savages had exhausted all the good names in their his-

Digitized by Google

torian's time, we know not, but they had certainly begun with the bad ones; one of their leading heroes being entitled Chief, or Lord Liar. *Nomine suo dignissimus*, as Dobrizhoffer says.

Even in our own country, in the lower classes, those who, from neglect, intemperance, and different forms of vice, are sunk lowest in the scale, this same decay of language may be observed. We believe that a searching inquiry into the actual vocabulary of many of our fellow-citizens would astonish even those prepared to be surprised by its miserable scantiness and poverty, and its lack of all power to express abstract or spiritual ideas. The desolation never can be ascertained in its real extent. Children drawn from the courts and alleys of crowded, neglected neighbourhoods to be taught and instructed, betray something of the evil. Their total ignorance of all words of dignity or elevation is a serious obstacle to their receiving ideas of that character. No one can tell how little the simplest truth can work its way into a mind weighed down by a low and degraded phraseology. For as it is the tendency of language, as it enlarges and refines itself, to give secondary meanings to words, to raise them from the literal to the figurative, and to apply to the actions and operations of the mind terms originally applied to bodily actions and visible objects, till the figurative meaning supersedes the literal in our minds, and of words whose flight leads us up to heaven, we do not remember that their nest was on the ground,—so in the degradation of language, an opposite order prevails. It resorts again to literal meanings and takes visible objects for its sole mode of expressing even spiritual things. Instead of embracing the idea, the vulgar are engrossed with the physical objects connected with it, they cannot get beyond what they see, and hear, and touch: having yielded to the tyranny of the senses, they are now their prey, and are confined within their range. Examples must be inadequate, and what is worse, they must be vulgar.—But as a faint illustration of our meaning: The teacher of a Sunday school has occasion to administer a reproof. He is grave and affectionate, he seeks to bring mind to bear on mind, to wake the conscience, to appeal to the feelings, to lift the intellect into a higher region of thought. The rebuke is not ill taken, not sullenly or in bad temper, but the culprit on reporting the occurrence, through no intentional disrespect, simply because he knows no other form of expression, says he has had a 'jawing,' and the reprover hears it whispered round that 'he's been "jawing" Dick Thompson;' this being the received word for clamorous upbraidings in scenes where, perhaps, wholesome reproof is little heard; and descriptive of the distortions of passion on the countenance, not of any mental operation: for in all cases where

Digitized by Google

body and spirit mingle, the tendency of the vulgar is to confine themselves to the consideration of the *body*. Thus death is always alluded to by them as it concerns the body, with eager appreciation of every circumstance bearing on this body's decay and dissolution. A lady in a mouring dress knocks at the door of a woman of this class where she has often visited. Mourning, of course, is associated with the idea of death. With the thoughtful of every degree, this is a complex idea. They think of loss, of the grief of the survivor, of a spirit departing to a new world, till the vast range of sympathies opened out for the dead and the living throw into the background the thought of dissolution and the grave. Not so with the observer here. In her the sight of a black gown raises no images but those of mortality — a coffin, a mound of loose earth, the sexton with his mattock standing by an open grave. No feelings are awakened of tenderness, compassion, or mystery; only curiosity to know who can be the subject of these terrors, suggesting at once the startling question put to her visitor without preface or delay, '*Have you buried one of your children?*' Even in the religion of the vulgar, where some ideas have been received of a future life, some knowledge of Christian truths, still the body *represents* the soul, and as their minds cannot or will not follow the soul's workings apart from it, they confound the aspirations of the heart with their outward manifestation. Ejaculations, which should be regarded simply as natural expressions of strong inward feeling, become the very thing to be desired for itself, and a person's salvation is considered secured, if, in the article of death, he has 'hallooed,' or, as it is familiarized, 'hollared a deal.' There is no awe in the vulgar mind,—we use this term 'vulgarity' to describe a state of mind, not a condition of life, though of course, those scenes where it can find freeest development are our present concern, and furnish our instances —no care to distinguish between the noble and the base, the sublime and the familiar; everything is reduced to the lowest standard; as where a hired nurse could find no more appropriate or elevating figure to express the tranquil departure of an old woman under her charge, though speaking gravely, and with an intention to convey a correct idea, than that 'she died as easy as an old shoe.' Yet, dull as the mind must be and dead to impressions, to resort to such a comparison, she could not have said this but from utter want of appropriate words and an ignorance that there were such. But we have dwelt long enough on a point which cannot be proved without some breach of rule and propriety. Such of our readers as have any experience of the dialect of the lowest classes, could readily add to our list of examples from a vocabulary which has never yet found its way into dictionaries or any respectable publication; a vocabulary rich enough in its

own line, but from which every term expressive of dignity or elevation is excluded.

It is time to draw our remarks to an end, though many interesting and suggestive portions of these lectures yet remain untouched. Their popular character is sustained throughout. The thoughtful reader, whatever his previous ignorance, is never carried beyond his depth, while the illustrations are so well chosen that he will, perhaps, be surprised to find himself warmly interesting in a subject which he had previously set down as dull and repulsive. It is, however, to be regretted that the style and composition,—we presume from carelessness,—are too often suited neither to the subject of the book nor its readers. The subject of words cannot be far separated from their right placing; Mr. Trench calls them jewels; we wish he had, in many cases, been more careful about their setting. It is a point in which clearness of style is more than commonly essential, for the reader is, as a first step, put into a critical frame of temper, and being called upon to criticise words, the next step is to criticise wording. Being led to think of our old masters of language, we cannot but sometimes institute comparisons between their classical accuracy, their clear order, the 'sweet tune' of their sentences even in prose, their majestic march, with the shambling gait, the mere getting along of some moderns. Our progress through some of the sentences in this little work reminds us more of a walk through a ploughed field than of a march of any kind or to any tune: its ups and downs being in very fair analogy with the alternations of assertion, and qualifying parentheses, which seems to form the system of their composition. The excuse no doubt is, that the lectures were at first orally delivered, and that a good reader can make anything he pleases of his own style; but we still cannot comprehend how Mr. Trench, who has shown in his verse a power of charming the ear as well as the understanding, could suffer such sentences as the following to pass from his pen to the press. As where he quotes 'The Spectator's' complaint of the introduction of new slang words, and then says:—

'In regard of "mob," abbreviated as we see from "mobile," the multitude swayed hither and thither by each gust of passion or caprice, this, which that writer plainly hardly expected, while he confessed it possible, has actually taken place.'—P. 125.

Again, in accounting for the gradual decay of language amongst savages, we have the following sentence, which we suspect would defy the parsing powers of the most practised of his auditors:—

'When wholly letting go the truth, when long and greatly sinning against light and conscience, a people has thus gone the downward way,

has been scattered off by some violent revolution from that portion of the world which is the seat of advance and progress, and driven to its remote isles and further corners, then, as one nobler thought, one spiritual idea after another has perished from it, the words also that expressed these have perished too.'—P. 17.

It may seem fastidious or querulous to be thus critical in the order of sentences, with whose matter we so fully agree; but accuracy of style is so essential to the life of books, and even to their present utility, that we cannot see a good book suffer from an awkward and careless style without a protest. We will conclude with the following happy example of the rich fulness of means which lies in single words, which it is one of Mr. Trench's points to prove:—

'Let me illustrate that which I have been here saying somewhat more at length by the word "tribulation." We all know in a general way that this word, which occurs not seldom in Scripture and in the Liturgy, means affliction, sorrow, anguish; but it is quite worth our while to know *how* it means this, and to question the word a little closer. It is derived from the Latin "tribulum," which was the threshing instrument or roller, whereby the Roman husbandmen separated the corn from the husks; and "tribulatio" in its primary significance was the act of this separation. "But some Latin writer of the Christian Church appropriated the word and image for the setting forth of a higher truth; and sorrow, distress and adversity being the appointed means for the separating in men of whatever in them was light, trivial, and poor, from the solid and the true, their chaff from their wheat, therefore he called these sorrows and griefs 'tribulations,' threshings, that is, of the inner spiritual man, without which there could be no fitting him for the heavenly garner."

'Now in proof of my assertion that a single word is often a concentrated poem, a little grain of gold, capable of being beaten out into a broad extent of gold-leaf, I will quote in reference to this very word "tribulation," a graceful composition by George Wither, an early English poet, which you will at once perceive is all wrapped up in this word, being from first to last only the expanding of the image and thought which this word has implicitly given:—

'"Till from the straw, the flail the corn doth beat,
Until the chaff be purgèd from the wheat;
Yea, till the mill the grains in pieces tear,
The richness of the flour will scarce appear.
So, till men's persons great afflictions touch,
If worth be found, their worth is not so much,
Because, like wheat in straw, they have not yet
That value which in threshing they may get.
For till the bruising flail of God's corrections
Have threshèd out of us our vain affections;
Till those affections which do misbecome us,
Are by the Sacred Spirit winnow'd from us;
Until from us the straw of wordly treasures,
Till all the dusty chaff of empty pleasures;
Yea, till His flail upon us He doth lay,
To thresh the husk of this our flesh away;
And leave the soul uncover'd; nay, yet more,
Till God shall make our very spirit poor,
We shall not up to highest wealth aspire,
And then we shall; and that is my desire."'—P. 7.

Digitized by Google

It will be well if the study of words and the investigation into their force and meaning, wherever pursued, may not stop with the intellect, but become, as they well may, a question with the heart, teaching it to weigh and consider with the more anxious care, as it is enlightened by knowledge, and taught to realize its responsibilities, how it shall acquit itself of a great duty:—ever bearing in mind the awful sentence which identifies the breath of our lips with our inmost thoughts and conscience,—'By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.'

Digitized by Google

ART. VII. *Japan: an Account, Geographical and Historical, &c. By* CHARLES MAC FARLANE. London: Routledge. 1852.

IN defiance of Mr. Mac Farlane's assertion to the contrary, we maintain that even educated persons know little or nothing about Japan. And yet it is called an Empire, and Mr. M'Culloch assures us that it contains 50,000,000 inhabitants: its population we believe actually reaches to half this amount. As far as general impressions go, the ordinary floating feeling—we cannot call it knowledge—about Japan, is, that it seems to realize a good deal the notions conveyed by Swift's Flying Island. We get to think of it as of some Atlantis of the East: a mystery and marvel seldom or very partially revealed to the sons of men. We hear of it as a place surrounded by prejudice as by a wall of brass: a polity complete and total in itself: a great exception to the family of mankind: like the fabled river of antiquity, it is a people which flows through the ocean of society but never mingles with the common stream of humanity. And then the whole world takes offence at this. While we are writing, the government of the United States is meditating an expedition to compel Japan to be neighbourly and civil, and to observe the conventional Law of Nations: that is to say, Western civilization is resolved to open out Japan—not for the sake of Japan, but for the necessities of Western civilization.

It is argued that no nation has a right to occupy an exceptional position: that commerce is, like the air, a chartered libertine; that no people has a right to say, I will not trade with others, except upon my own terms. If the Japanese systematically refused food and water, and the means of repairs to ships, we should say that the American claim was not unreasonable. No nation has a right to block up the highway and to prevent legitimate traffic with others. If it does not choose to trade itself, it must not present an hindrance to trading with others. It is very well to say that Japan must be treated as though it did not exist, and that our proper course is to take it upon its own grounds, and simply avoid it. But common sense revolts at this theorizing: the Japanese Empire lies right across some fifteen degrees of latitude: it is a physical obstruction if it does not conform to the natural laws of mankind. Navigation involves certain abstract rights, which are not so much a matter of common consent as of antecedent natural justice. A ship in distress has claims for water, wood, and fresh provisions, and for means of refitting and repairing accidents. These claims are not a matter of political agreement, but are physical results from the mere constitution of the planet. And in this sense, and for fundamental elementary

necessities, the earth and sea are common property. But as a fact, Japan does not refuse these elementary rights. To take only our own vessels: in 1791 the 'Argonaut' received wood and water. The 'Providence' landed its crew for nautical observations on the coast of Yesso, and refitted. The 'Phaeton,' Captain 'Pellew,' in the early part of the present century took in water. The 'Samarang' was in 1845 supplied with stores by the Japanese authorities; and magnetic observations were, though very reluctantly, permitted. In 1849, Captain Mackinon of H.M.S. 'Mariner,' received vegetables and water from the islanders.

What the Japanese decline is, to trade with any other country except on their own terms. Acutely enough, they guard against the slightest violation of their principle of exclusion. In all the cases which we have mentioned payment for supplies sent on board was refused. The transaction was one of natural charity, not of commerce. Under these circumstances the question is simply whether we can, or ought to, force such a people to trade with us whether they like it or not. The vague series of conventionalisms known as the Law of Nations, has certainly never been accepted by Japan. Vattel is not a text book at Jeddo, nor even in Bundum, which Peter Heylyn affirmed to be 'an university bigger than Paris.' We hardly think that it is fair to quote Puffendorf and Grotius to a community of this sort. And it is difficult to pick a quarrel with Japan. If the Japanese refused assistance to a shipwrecked vessel, this might be the pretext for forcing their ports. As it stands, all that the American President can say is, 'Japan is within 'twenty days' sail of California: Japan has coal, and it would be 'very useful to our steamers: Japan has admirable productions, 'both natural and manufactured; the States have the same: 'reciprocity and trade are very good things: friendly commercial 'intercourse is a great blessing,' &c. But as the Japanese cannot or will not see this, the serious question remains, whether there is any inherent right in one nation, or in all the nations of the earth collectively, to force an outstanding member of mankind into the commercial brotherhood. Speech is a great blessing, and necessary to the existence of society, but if any individual is so sulky or so unmanageable as to decline conversation, we doubt the natural right in his neighbour to make him talk.

Nor are our doubts lessened when we survey the anomalous and extraordinary history of Japan. It was unknown to recent research, till the noble Venetian, Marco Polo, at the end of the thirteenth century, noticed it. The first European who seems to have visited it was Fernam Mendez Pinto, the Portuguese adventurer, whose name, very unjustly, has been considered equivalent to mendacity itself. This visit was in 1542: the

Digitized by Google

Portuguese were most hospitably received, and allowed free traffic. Seven years after a fugitive Japanese fled to Goa, and was converted to Christianity. The Portuguese, combining worldly wisdom with a deep sense of spiritual duties, at once saw the opening both for trade and the Gospel which Japan afforded: and as early as 1551 the splendid and successful mission of Xavier to Japan had been terminated by the Jesuit apostle's death. Fifty churches and tens of thousands of converts composed the Japanese Church of twenty years later. During the whole of this time—

'The Portuguese,—mariners, merchants, padres, and all,—were received with open arms, not only at Bungo, but at whatsoever other part of the empire they chose to repair unto. The local governments and the minor princes, who then enjoyed a considerable degree of independence, vied with each other in inviting them to their ports and towns. They went wherever they pleased, from one extremity of the empire to the other, and by land as well as by sea. The merchants found a ready and a most profitable market for their goods; the missionaries, an intellectual, tolerant people, very willing to listen to the lessons which they had to teach them. There was no *one* established, dominant religion in the country; the most ancient faith was split into sects; and there were at least three other religions imported from foreign countries, and tolerated in the most perfect manner. Moreover, a faith, said to be of Brahminical origin, and which had been imported from India, was, at the time, widely spread among the people. This faith bore so near a resemblance to the doctrines introduced by the Portuguese, that it must have greatly favoured their reception. It appears to have comprised the *existence, death, and resurrection of a Saviour born of a virgin*, with almost every other essential dogma of Christianity, including the belief in the Trinity. If this be a true statement and correct description, and if we then add to it the tradition, that this form of religion was introduced under the reign of the Chinese emperor Mimti, who ascended the throne in about the fiftieth year of the Christian era, can we avoid admitting the conclusion, that some early apostle reached the eastern extremity of Asia, if not the islands themselves of Japan? Then the pomp and impressive ceremonials of the Roman church, and the frequency of its services, delighted the impressionable Japanese, who, in all probability, would have paid far less attention to a simpler form of worship. The first missionaries, moreover, were men of exemplary lives—modest, virtuous, disinterested, and most tender and charitable to the poor and afflicted. They sought out cases of distress; they attended the sick; and some knowledge they possessed of the superior science of medicine, as practised by the most advanced nations of Europe, was frequently of great benefit to the natives, and another means of facilitating their conversion. Xavier quitted Japan for China in 1551, and died on the second of December of the following year, at Shan-Shan, on the Canton river, not far from Macao; but he left able and enthusiastic missionaries behind him, and others soon repaired to the country.'—*Mac Farlane's Japan*, pp. 4—7.

Without discussing Mr. Mac Farlane's assumption of an apostolic journey to Japan, it is unquestionable that Nestorian missionaries had penetrated into China at a very early period. The celebrated inscription proves this. Whether Buddhism, which is not the original religion of Japan, is, according to

Digitized by Google

a singular conjecture, a diabolic anticipation of Christianity; or whether much of its present rites and doctrines are not rather corruptions of the Gospel, it is enough to feel convinced that Buddhism does present in itself a singular caricature and distortion of the Gospel. It does not quite appear whether the Japanese Christians were converts from Buddhism, or from the older and national religion of the Sintoos, which seems to differ little from the common Indian systems. The question would be important whether such a resemblance as Buddhism offers of Christianity would be an aid or an obstacle to conversion? The fact however remains, that in less than half a century from its rediscovery, Japan was at free commercial intercourse with the whole western world, and was the seat of a flourishing and promising Church. Before, therefore, we are so especially angry with the Japanese for their seclusion from the world, the inquiry is of immense interest, how the present state of things came about, and who is responsible for it.

It is plain that two hundred and fifty years ago the Japanese ports were open to all ordinary commercial intercourse. The Portuguese had a monopoly of it, chiefly because they had no competitors. Such, however, presented themselves with the seventeenth century. One William Adams, an Englishman, sailed as pilot to a 'fleet of Hollanders,' equipped for the Indian trade in 1598. During this voyage a storm brought him to the Japanese coast. But strange vessels had at that period become suspicious. It is undeniable that Dutch and English ships, if not avowedly buccaneers, acted very piratically. The obligation of treaties ceased at the line. On the Spanish main it was simply Rob Roy's law. We can quite therefore account for and admit 'the evil report made by the Portuguese of the English and 'Dutch.' The Portuguese could not esteem them as other than pirates. The consequence was that William Adams was detained in Japan until the day of his death. But he did his work: he opened the trade to his Dutch friends, who, in 1609, 'came to 'the court of the Emperor, where they were in great friendship 'received, conditioning with the Emperor to send yearly a ship 'or two; the first of which, arriving in 1611, was well received, 'and with great kindness entertained.'

When we say that the Japanese ports and commerce were open to all traders, it must not be understood that, two hundred and fifty years ago, either in Japan or anywhere else was trade carried on with that freedom from local restraints which now generally prevails. What we mean is, that, under regulations, any European community might have got a commercial footing in Japan. Trade was then generally conducted by corporations and factories rather than by individual enterprise. Even in our

Digitized by Google

own East India trade, up to a comparatively recent period, the quantity of exports and imports was fixed. It was at that time considered necessary to keep up prices by restricting trade. To throw tea and spices overboard is a practice not yet forgotten. It is quite conceivable, therefore, how early in the seventeenth century commercial intercourse with Japan might be free; and yet with a restriction on the number of vessels and amount of commodities permitted to enter its ports.

Before the year 1620, then, the Portuguese and Dutch factories were established side by side on a small island, called Firando, looking over the Corean straits. They were not likely to prove themselves pleasant neighbours or agreeable guests. Of course in those days the Dutch in Portuguese eyes appeared only as heretics, if not atheists; while the Dutch returned the compliment by stigmatizing their brother Christians as mere idolaters. The mutual hatred and suspicions existing between Holland and Portugal were not likely to impress the calm and inquiring Japanese with exalted notions either of Christians in general or Europeans in particular. Nor were the native Christians such as had kindled under Xavier's words of fire, or had melted before his glow of love. Persecution had commenced on the part of the heathen; the Christian orders were divided against each other; Dominican and Franciscan were mutually misrepresented, and stumbling-blocks innumerable were thrown in the Japanese path to the Gospel, and this we fear by Christian hands. The sad history of the proscription of the Gospel in Japan may be told in few words. The Christians may have become rapacious; but it is certain that old powerful heathenism at last found out that toleration of Christianity was in the end treason to Buddhism and Sintooism. No religions could co-exist with the Cross. Christianity must be accepted or destroyed. The Japanese nationalists preferred the latter part of the alternative. The arrival of more missionaries was first forbidden; then conversions were prohibited; at last, a persecution terrible as that of Decius commenced. In 1614 the native converts who would not recant were crucified and tortured; the churches were destroyed; the schools closed, and the profession of Christianity in a Japanese declared illegal. Hitherto the foreign Christians had not been persecuted; but Portuguese missionaries were constantly evading the law. The commercial result was the restriction of foreign trade to the little island of Desima.

But worse remained. A real, or suspected, plot against the Japanese government, said to have been entered into by the Japanese Christians, implicated the Portuguese. It is curious, to say the least, that the documentary evidence of this plot was found in 'a Portuguese ship captured by the *Dutch*.' Whether

the Dutch invented the plot, or only took advantage of it, we cannot pronounce. It is indisputable that they denounced it to the Japanese government; and the result was, that the Portuguese were banished for ever from Japan and its dependencies. Nor was this all. From 1637 commenced the exclusive policy of the Japanese of which Europeans complain. The proclamation which decreed that 'the whole race of the Portuguese, with their mothers, nurses, and whatever belongs to them, shall be banished for ever,' goes on to set forth—

'That no Japanese ship or boat, or any native of Japan, should henceforth presume to quit the country under pain of forfeiture and death; that any Japanese returning from a foreign country should be put to death; that no nobleman or soldier should be suffered to purchase anything of a foreigner; that any person presuming to bring a letter from abroad, or to return to Japan after he had been banished, should die, with all his family, and that whosoever presumed to intercede for such offenders should be put to death, &c.; that all persons who propagated the doctrines of the Christians, or bore that scandalous name, should be seized and immured in the common gaol, &c. A reward was offered for the discovery of every padre or priest, and a smaller reward for the discovery of every native Christian.' —*Ibid.* p. 48.

Here it is obvious to remark, that whichever version of this incident is true, whether the Portuguese did enter into a political plot against the Japanese government, or whether the Dutch, out of mere jealousy to Portugal, invented the conspiracy, and the Portuguese complicity with it, the result is the same. The Japanese expelled Europeans, and restricted their intercourse with the whole world, on account of European intrigue. They acted in self-defence. Their policy might be short-sighted and bigoted: but the Europeans compelled it. We are only witnessing and suffering under the untoward results of the duplicity and intrigues, or the treachery and bigotry, of the seventeenth century.

This was the hour of temptation to the Dutch, and they were not proof against it. Bitter rivals both in commerce and religion to the Portuguese, they did all they could to exasperate the contest between the Portuguese and Japanese. If they did not cause the Portuguese expulsion, they mainly contributed to it; and this under the most discreditable and degrading circumstances. Though nominally a dispute between Japan and Portugal, it was, in fact, a controversy between Heathenism and Christianity. The Dutch took their side and kept it. They ranged themselves with persecution and apostasy. We avail ourselves of Mr. Mac Farlane's judgment in the case, and he is not a prejudiced witness:—

'Though deprived of their padres, or European teachers, and though menaced, not only with imprisonment, but also with torture and death, the converts persevered in their faith. Oppression drove them into open rebellion; and they took refuge, and made an heroical stand against the

Digitized by Google

troops of the emperor in the province of Simabara. The imperial government called upon the Dutch to assist them in their war against these Christians; and the Dutch promptly gave the aid required of them. The fact is admitted by all their own countrymen who have written about Japan, from their first writers in the middle of the seventeenth century, down to the year 1833. M. Fischer, the very last on the list, says that the Dutch were *compelled* to join in the persecution against the stubborn remnant of that Christian host. Others would soften the matter by saying that the Dutch *only* supplied the heathen Japanese with gunpowder and guns, taught them a little artillery practice, and sent ammunition, arms, and troops in their ships to the scene of action. But Kämpfer, who was only a German in the Dutch service, most distinctly and positively assures us that the Christian traders acted as auxiliaries and belligerents. The stronghold of the native Christians was an old fortified place, which the emperor's troops could not take.

'"The Dutch, upon this, as friends and allies of the emperor, were requested to assist the Japanese in the siege . . . . M. Kockebecker, who was then director of the Dutch trade and nation, having received the emperor's orders to this purpose, repaired thither without delay, on board a Dutch ship, lying at anchor in the harbour of Firando (all the other ships, perhaps upon some intimation given, that some such request was like to be made to them from court, set sail but the day before), and within a fortnight's time he battered the old town with 426 cannon-balls, both from on board his ship and from a battery which was raised on shore, and planted with some of his own guns. This compliance of the Dutch, and their conduct during the siege, was entirely to the satisfaction of the Japanese, and although the besieged seemed in no manner of forwardness to surrender, yet, as by this cannonading they had been very much reduced in number, and their strength greatly broken, M. Kockebecker had leave at last to depart, after they had obliged him to land six more of his guns for the use of the emperor."

'A recent writer, a right-hearted and right-minded American, says,—"The walls of Simabara were unquestionably battered by the Dutch cannon, and its brave defenders were slaughtered. Some apology might be made for this cooperation at the siege of Simabara, had its defenders been the countrymen of Alva, or Requesens, or John of Austria, or Alexander Farnese. But truth requires that the measures of Kockebecker should be regarded as the alternative, which he deliberately preferred to the interruption of the Dutch trade."

'It appears that the siege was converted into a long and close blockade, and that when the indomitable converts of Xavier were reduced, and in good part exterminated by famine, a storm and an atrocious massacre ensued, none being spared, because none would recant and beg quarter; but men, women, and children being all butchered in heaps. In this war of religion, according to the most moderate estimate, there fell on both sides 40,000 men. According to the papists, the number of native Christians alone was far greater than this, and all the atrocities and horrors of the Diocletian persecution were repeated, exaggerated, and prolonged. The magnitude of the holocaust does indeed afford some measure of the depth and tenacity with which Christianity, in its Roman form, had struck its roots into the soil.

'Over the vast common grave of the martyrs was set up this impious inscription:—"So long as the sun shall warm the earth, let no Christian be so bold as to come to Japan; and let all know, that the King of Spain himself, or the Christians' God, or the great God of all, if he violate this command, shall pay for it with his head."'—*Ibid.* pp. 49—52.

Digitized by Google

The Dutch, however, were disappointed in their hopes: they

derived less benefit from their intrigues and apostasy than they expected. One of themselves, Kämpfer, admits this:—

'"By this submissive readiness to assist the emperor in the execution of his designs, with regard to the final destruction of Christianity in his dominions, it is true, indeed, that we stood our ground so far as to maintain ourselves in the country, and to be permitted to carry on our trade, although the court had then some thoughts of a total exclusion of all foreigners whatsoever. But many generous and noble persons, at court and in the country, judged unfavourably of our conduct. It seemed to them inconsistent with reason that the Dutch should ever be expected to be faithful to a foreign monarch, and one, too, whom they look upon as a heathen, whilst they showed so much forwardness to assist him in the destruction of a people with whom they agreed in the most essential parts of their faith (as the Japanese had been well informed by the Portuguese monks), and to sacrifice to their own worldly interests those who followed Christ in the very same way, and hoped to enter the kingdom of heaven through the same gate. These are expressions which I have often heard from the natives, when the conversation happened to turn upon this mournful subject. In short, by our humble complaisance and connivance, we were so far from bringing this proud and jealous nation to any greater confidence, or more intimate friendship, that, on the contrary, their jealousy and mistrust seemed to increase from that time. They both hated and despised us for what we had done. In the year 1641, soon after the total expulsion of the Portuguese, and the suppression of Christianity among the natives, we were ordered to quit our comfortable factory at Firando, and to confine ourselves, under a very rigid inspection, to the small islet of Desima, which is more like a prison than a factory. So great was the covetousness of the Dutch, and so strong the alluring power of the Japanese gold, that rather than quit the prospect of a trade, (indeed most advantageous,) they willingly underwent an almost perpetual imprisonment, for such in fact is our residence at Desima, and chose to suffer many hardships in a foreign and heathen country, to be remiss in performing divine Service on Sundays and solemn festivals, to leave off praying and singing of psalms, entirely to avoid the sign of the cross, the calling upon the name of Christ in presence of the natives, and all the outer signs of Christianity; and lastly, patiently and submissively to bear the abusive and injurious behaviour of these proud infidels towards us, than which nothing can be offered more shocking to a generous and noble mind."'—*Ibid.* pp. 52—54.

To this miserable islet, Desima, the Dutch are confined; the island is only 600 feet long, and is joined to the Japanese city, Nagasaki, by a bridge strongly guarded. The most rigid watch is held on the Dutch; no females are allowed in their community. Their vessels are searched, the guns and ammunition removed, and the crews are only allowed 'to refresh themselves' in this filthy prison, Desima; a fit punishment for their treason to the faith and their brethren. They have the gold for which they bartered the gospel duties, but it is poured molten down their throats. With respect to their practical renunciation of Christianity, we follow Mr. Mac Farlane:—

'All who serve the Dutch, or have any close dealings with them, are bound to take a solemn oath of renunciation and hatred of the Christian religion, once, twice, or even three times a-year; and, at least at one of

these ceremonies, they are made to trample under foot crosses and crucifixes, with the image of the Redeemer upon them. The ill-meant, mocking, impious jests of Voltaire, as to the Dutch going through the same ceremony, may not have been, at every period, quite destitute of truth. As Lutherans or Presbyterians they may have entertained no more reverence for crosses and crucifixes and images of saints, than was felt by our English Puritans, who, in the days of their prepotency, found a rude delight in destroying such articles, and treating them with every imaginable disrespect. The Portuguese, when driven to despair through their hated rivals, nearly involved the Dutch in their own ruin by announcing to the imperial government that they were Christians like themselves. It behoved the Dutch to convince the Japanese that there was the widest difference between them; that they belonged to a sect quite hostile to that of the Portuguese; that they hated Pope, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and all manner of monks and priests. We can, therefore, easily credit that, if put by the Japanese government to that test, the Dutchmen would not much scruple to trample upon the cross in the manner described by Voltaire. A bigoted Presbyterian would even find a pleasure in so doing. An old Nangasakian joke is, that a Dutchman, at the time of the great persecution, being surprised in some place by the Japanese police, and being asked whether he were a Christian, replied, "No! I am a Dutchman." We fear, indeed, that after any lengthened residence in the country, such religion as these Dutchmen carried with them was almost wholly evaporated. The life led in their prison at Nagasaki was little calculated to foster devotional feelings. Kämpfer says that in his time they lived like a set of heathens,—that the principles of Christianity were so little conspicuous in their lives and actions, that the Japanese were absurd in fearing that they would attempt the conversion of the heathens.'—*Ibid.* pp. 57, 58.

After this Mr. Mac Farlane must have ventured upon a gentle jest, when he goes on to observe: 'But good and religious men 'have gone through this ordeal without any detriment to their 'faith or morals; so let not these remarks be taken as un-'charitable, or as disrespectful to the Dutch.'

It is, perhaps, fortunate for us that we were never subjected to the like temptations. The history of the English commercial intercourse with Japan does not admit of abridgment, and it is curious as an almost solitary instance of English failure in trade:—

'Through the help and admirable diplomacy of Adams, a commercial treaty, or a series of privileges, more favourable than any ever enjoyed by Portuguese or by Dutch, was granted to the English, and apparently without any demur or delay on the part of the imperial court.

'The first article in these original privileges of 1613 runs thus:—"We give free license to the King of England's subjects, Sir Thomas Smith, Governor, and Company of the East India Merchants, for ever, safely to come *into any our ports* or empire of Japan, with their ships and merchandise, without hindrance to them or their goods; and to abide, buy, sell, and barter, according to their own manner with all nations; and to tarry so long as they will, and depart at their pleasure."

'The second article exempted English goods from all manner of customs or duties; the third granted to the English full freedom of building houses in any part of the empire, which houses, at their departure, they might freely sell; the fourth article placed the property of any English subject that might die in the empire under the sole control of the captain, merchant, or English resident, and exempted entirely all English subjects, whatever their offences, from the somewhat summary process of Japanese

law; and the three remaining articles were all in the same liberal and most friendly spirit.

'These privileges were, however, somewhat modified in 1616, when the English, wherever they might arrive on the coast, were ordered to repair immediately to the port and town Firando, there to sell their merchandise, and not to stay at, or trade, in any other port whatsoever. But it was ordered at the same time, that, in case of contrary winds or bad weather, the English ships might abide in any other port, without paying anchorage duties; and the people were enjoined to treat such ships in a friendly manner, and to sell them whatsoever they might require. At the same time, all the other valuable privileges of 1613 were confirmed. Captain Cock, who established himself at Firando, and remained in the country long after the departure of Saris, paid more than one visit to the imperial court at Jeddo.

'Our factory at Firando, or rather, perhaps, those who managed their shipments in England, made an injudicious selection of merchandise, sending out commodities which were not in request in that country. In this manner the trade was conducted, rather at a loss than profit; and this, with some other circumstances of discouragement, induced the East India Company prematurely to abandon the experiment.

'"Of the English," says a recent English writer, (Rundall,) "it is simply to be observed, that in their commercial project they failed, and that they retired with honour, and regretted, from the scene of their misadventure." In the year 1623, after upwards of 40,000*l.* had been uselessly expended, they entirely withdrew from that country and trade.'—*Ibid.* pp. 66—69.

From that time to the present the Japanese have maintained their policy, not, as we have said, without justification. And we have been thus minute in our historical statement, because we doubt whether here or in the United States much is known of the antecedents of the present state of things in Japan.

We were attracted to the name of Japan, chiefly on account of the commercial interests involved in the proposed American expedition to these islands. Proposed, we say, for we have not heard much of it lately. If this expedition is undertaken as one of aggression, we cannot doubt but that the Americans, fertile in expedients for aggrandisement, will find some occasion for mortal quarrel with the poor islanders. One presents itself *in limine:* it is the practice of the Japanese authorities to surround all foreign ships on their arrival with a triple circle of guard-boats. A ship-of-war may not unreasonably regard this as an insult. A *casus belli* is at once established; and a pretext for a collision given. A lesson is to be read: the Japanese towns are battered, and immense destruction of life and property ensues. The local authorities, military and civil, are held responsible at the seat of government. With one consent they all rip up their bowels—the prescribed method of suicide—in atonement for neglect of duty. The Americans occupy and retain an island on the coast: the old story between China and England is repeated, and free-trade and the Gospel once more enter Japan, through seas of blood. Whether in either case, that of China or Japan, the best course is adopted, either for

recommending our commercial policy or our religion in these places may be questioned.

But having reached Japan, we may as well survey the mysterious region to which an isolated circumstance has transferred some share of public curiosity. The islands forming the combined Japanese and Kurile archipelago are of considerable length, and very scanty width. Adopting Humboldt's parallel view of the original conformation of the Atlantic islands as the summits of a submerged chain of mountains, it seems not improbable that a similar origin may be given to the Japanese group, which is only a single member of a prolonged chain of volcanic peaks, ranging from Kamschatka through the Aleutian, Japanese and Philippine Islands, down to the southern tropic. They are all volcanic,—indeed, some are active volcanoes; and they present an axis more or less parallel with that of the coast. This gives a great diversity of climate; and, as is well known, by the variation in the isothermal lines, the cold region comes down very far on the eastern coast of Asia. The Japanese possessions, therefore, range from a semi-tropical climate to one approaching to that of Kamschatka. We read of the bamboo as indigenous to Japan, and most extensively used; the camphor-tree and tea-tree are grown in the most southern island, but the Kurile islands, to which the empire extends, have no better climate than that of Norway. This accounts for the very different terms in which travellers describe Japan,—at one time as the chosen seat of fog and frost and storm, at another, as equal to the garden of the Hesperides.

Mr. Mac Farlane, in what he says of the physical geography of Japan, is neither scientific nor consecutive. Indeed, in the absence of any detailed account, we are left to pick up such information from the most scanty and scattered intimations of various writers. At Nagasaki, the southern port, the thermometer is said to range between 35° and 98° Fahrenheit. At Jeddo, the capital, snow falls every year. The population of this place was once reckoned at 2,000,000. It is doubtless a large place, and larger because it is built after the old Oriental type, in which, as in the interior cities of China, as we learn from Mr. Fortune, vast open spaces are enclosed within the walls.

There is a largeness and roundness in the older oriental descriptions, which certainly satisfies the mind and fills it with a composing sense of breadth and magnitude. Japan, as described, is no exception. Everything seems to be on the most imposing scale. Miaco, the ecclesiastical capital, contains precisely, we are assured, 6000 temples. Marco Polo, speaking of Japan, which he dignifies with the sonorous name of Zipangu,

Digitized by Google

assures us that the great 'palace was roofed with gold considerably thick,—covered with it as we cover churches with lead.' The palace of the Kobo with its gardens is, we are assured, eight miles in circumference: this palace must be of the same aspect as that which

> 'In Xanadu did Kublai Khan
> A stately pleasure-house decree,
> Where Alph, the sacred river, ran.'

But there are no rivers of any size in Japan; the narrowness of the islands and the general bearing of the elevation preventing it. The Fudsi Jamma, compared to the Pico in Teneriffe, is the highest volcanic peak, and is said to be 12,000 feet high; the height indeed of the Pico—which is only 3,000 feet short of that of Mont Blanc. It cannot be so high as this, for the Dutch speak of 'the snow seldom melting on it.' We conceive that in such a climate as that of Jeddo, near which the mountain is laid down in the maps, the line of perpetual snow must be below 12,000 feet. The largest island, Niphon, is in length 900 miles; the greatest width of any of the group is about 100 miles.

The government of Japan is remarkable: it recals the double kings of Sparta—dare we say of Brentford? There is a Secular Emperor, the Kobo, and an Ecclesiastical Emperor, the Mikado or Daïri, who reign co-ordinately. Such at least is the common account; but one which we cannot assent to put in this vague way. The government was a sort of theocracy, because an especial sanctity was attached to the person who reigned. In all early states of society the sacerdotal and kingly offices were considered identical. The emperor ruled by divine right and by inheritance, and was the representative descendant of the gods; we do not find, as in the later developments of Buddhism, that he was an incarnation of the Divinity. In fact, this latter view (the Thibetan) may only have arisen from the literal translation of a metaphor. But as in Thibet so in Japan, the theocracy was a convenient theory for the aristocracy of the sacerdotal caste. The emperor in Japan, or the Dalai Lama in Thibet, seems to lead the life of the Lucretian gods. The Mikado lives shut up in his palace, 'with one wife and twelve concubines, plenty of paper, books, and music.' But the dignity is dreary enough.

'"Even to this day," says Kämpfer, "the princes descended from the family, more particularly those who sit on the throne, are looked upon as persons most holy in themselves, and as Popes by birth. And, in order to preserve these advantageous notions in the minds of their subjects, they are obliged to take an uncommon care of their sacred persons, and to do such things, which, examined according to the customs of other nations, would be thought ridiculous and impertinent. It will not be improper to give a few instances. The ecclesiastical emperor thinks that it would be very prejudicial to his dignity and holiness to touch the ground with his feet: for this reason, when he intends to go anywhere, he must be carried

Digitized by Google

thither on men's shoulders. Much less will they suffer, that he should expose his sacred person to the open air; and the sun is not thought worthy to shine on his head. There is such a holiness ascribed to all parts of the body, that he dares to cut off neither his hair, nor his beard, nor his nails. However, lest he should grow too dirty, they may clean him in the night when he is asleep; because, they say, that what is taken from his body at that time hath been stolen from him, and that such a theft doth not prejudice his holiness or dignity. In ancient times, he was obliged to sit on the throne for some hours every morning, with the imperial crown on his head, but to sit altogether like a statue, without stirring either hands or feet, head or eyes, nor indeed any part of his body, because, by this means, it was thought that he could preserve peace and tranquillity in his empire; for if, unfortunately, he turned himself on one side or the other, or if he looked a good while towards any part of his dominions, it was apprehended that war, famine, fire, or some other great misfortune, was near at hand to desolate the country. But it having been afterwards discovered, that the imperial crown was the palladium which, by its immobility, could preserve peace in the empire, it was thought expedient to deliver his imperial person, consecrated only to idleness and pleasure, from this burthensome duty, and therefore the crown, alone, is at present placed on the throne for several hours every morning. His victuals must be dressed every time in new pots, and served at table in new dishes: both are very clean and neat, but made only of common clay, that, without any considerable expense, they may be laid aside, or broken, after they have served once. They are generally broken, for fear they should come into the hands of laymen; for they believe religiously, that if any layman should presume to eat his food out of these sacred dishes, it would swell and inflame his mouth and throat. The like ill effect is dreaded from the Daïri's sacred habits; for they believe that if a layman should wear them, without the emperor's express leave or command, they would occasion pains in all parts of his body." '—*Ibid.* pp. 171—173.

But what is really an exceptional case is, that this theocracy descends occasionally to females, and that the spiritual emperor may be, in short, an empress. The throne, when vacant, is filled by a nominee of the Council; that is, the Pope is elected by the Cardinals. Elected we say, for though the succession is nominally in a right line, yet the Council determines who is the nearest heir, which, in a country where polygamy is permitted, opens a large door to external interest.

The rise of the secular emperor seems to have been this:—Japan was a strictly feudal state; the separate dukes and counts, as we should call them, only paid a nominal obedience to the spiritual emperor. Then arose, as in Europe, the great struggle between the Suzerain and the independent holders of fiefs. We all know how it terminated in Europe, by the king calling into existence a burgher, or middle class, and throwing himself on the municipalities. The kings of France and England dissolved the powerful confederacies of the nobles—in Japan matters took the opposite course. In feudal countries there will always be some prominent baron, some Warwick or the like, who holds the real sway. He commands the army in the West—in

Digitized by Google

the East he is Vizier. It requires but a single step to make the office of Mayor of the Palace hereditary; this process was effected in Japan, and the Ziogun, the officer who held this dignity, though he did not at first assume the imperial name, soon acquired all the real power of the empire. The first Ziogun assumed office about the middle of the twelfth century, so that some strange political affinity and change in social relations was working on the Seine and in Niphon at the same time. He was not then, nor is he now, theoretically joint emperor with the Daïri; he is only the secular king. He held all the real power, but a certain theoretical supremacy is reserved to the Daïri, or Mikado, the ecclesiastical emperor. It was not till 1585 that the title Ziogun, General-in-Chief, was expanded into that of Kobo, which is the present appellation of the (so-called) secular emperor. It is only in this sense that Japan has two emperors; that Church and State both bear imperial sway, and that a conjoint, yet separate dynasty, celestial and terrestrial, rules without collision or interference. Curiously enough, the fate which overtook the Daïri has pursued the Kobo; the lay and spiritual emperors are both reduced to shadows, the sovereignty either of Church or State is merely ideal and fictitious; the Daïri sleeps away his torpid existence at Miaco, the self-torturing shadow of departed greatness, while the Kobo is immersed in dignified, but unauthoritative, seclusion in his palace at Jeddo. The charmed slumbers of the famous king in the 'Sleeping Beauty,' are the only parallel for the imperial state of Japan.

We must, however, remark, that the political history of Japan, since the expulsion of the Portuguese, is very scanty. This principle of dualism, which the lay and clerical empires present, is said, with what truth we know not, to pervade other Japanese institutions.

It remains to give some account of the religion of Japan, which, from the extremely perplexed and conflicting statements on the subject, is far from easy. The recognised religion, as we said, is Sintooism, though it would be hard to say what Sintooism is. The Japanese, however, seem to have solved the problem which causes so much trouble to European states. There is an established religion, and there is the most perfect toleration—purchased, as such a system only can be purchased, by an entire surrender of principle on every side. The Kobo sends an embassy, or goes on a pilgrimage to his ecclesiastical elder brother, the Sintoo Emperor, and at the same time builds a Buddhist temple; while the Daïri, the prince and priest of Sintooism, allows the easy importation of strange gods into the sacred temples of his own faith. In fact, it is the height of

Digitized by Google

politeness for different religious professors to attend the worship of the gods of their friends. The only thing, as of old, which is proscribed, is Christianity; neither the Japanese nor the Roman empire would refuse the Cross its intercommunion in rites. It is the exclusiveness of the Gospel which is its scandal.

Sintooism was perhaps originally a form of Sabæanism; its chief divinity is the Goddess of the Sun. She is worshipped through the mediation of inferior gods and deified mortals. Some doctrine of a future state, and of rewards and punishments, is retained; but the actual duties of religion consist in, 1, Preservation of pure fire; 2, Purity of the heart and body; 3, The observance of festival days; 4, Pilgrimage; and, 5, The public and private *cultus* of the inferior gods and saints—the Kami. These last seem to be the ordinary Teraphim of the eastern, and Penates of classical worship. The temple and domestic worship is thus described:—

'The religious observances on festival days appear to be very simple and very short. The worshipper, clad in his best clothes, approaches the temple, performs his ablutions at a tank, kneels in the veranda opposite a grated window, through which he can fix his eyes on the mirror; he then offers up his prayers, and a sacrifice of rice, fruit, tea, sackee, or the like; deposits a little money in a box, and takes his departure, to spend the rest of the day in sports and pastimes, or in the manner he thinks best. According to Kämpfer, they conclude their ceremonies at the temple by striking three times upon a bell, which is hung over the door, believing the gods to be highly delighted with the sounds of musical instruments. "All this being done, they retire, to divert themselves the remaining part of the day with walking, exercises, sports, eating and drinking, and treating one another to good things." The temple must not be approached with a downcast spirit or a sorrowful countenance, for that might disturb the placid beatitude of the Kami.'—*Ibid.* pp. 209, 210.

The domestic rites of the ancient and dominant Japanese religion are not well known. If Siebold, from whom the account is taken, is to be trusted, the last sentence, apart from its awkward phraseology, in the following extract is very curious:—

'At home in every Sintoo house, each meal is preceded by a short prayer, and in nearly every garden or courtyard attached to such house, there is a miniature mya, or temple. The Sintoo priests are called *Kami-Nusi*, or the hosts or landlords of the gods; they dwell in houses built within the grounds attached to the temples. The money deposited by the worshippers goes into their purse, and the oblations of rice, fruit, tea, and the rest, go to their kitchen and table. They have thus the means of hospitality, and are said to exercise it liberally to strangers. The Dutch, however, always found, that in their case, a return in solid cash was expected, and that these temple-visits were very expensive. Celibacy is no tenet of the Sintoos; the Kami-Nusi marry, and their wives are priestesses, to whom specific rites and duties are allotted. It appears that they act as god-

Digitized by Google

mothers general to all the female children of their sect that are born in Japan, giving them their names, sprinkling them with water, and performing other ceremonies.'—*Ibid.* pp. 210, 211.

We need hardly remark, that the parallel which Mr. Mac Farlane seems to suggest between what he calls the Japanese Pilgrimages and the Romanist devotion to shrines, is singularly inaccurate. The sacred regulation of the law for all the males to appear at Jerusalem, is a closer parallel. However, as the writer whom we have hitherto followed has compiled with general accuracy, we may take his facts apart from his inferences:—

'Pilgrimage is the grand and most sanctifying act of Sintoo devotion. There are no fewer than twenty-two shrines in different parts of the empire, which are frequented annually, or more frequently by the devout. The most conspicuous, and most honoured of all—the very Loretto of the Japanese,—is Isye, with its ancient temple of Ten-sio-dai-zin, or the Sun Goddess. The principal temple is surrounded by nearly a hundred small ones, which have little else of a temple than the mere shape, being, for the most part, so low and narrow, that a man can scarcely stand up in them. Each of these temples, or little chapels, is attended by a priest. Near to them live multitudes of priests and functionaries, who call themselves the messengers of the gods, and who keep houses and lodgings to accommodate travellers and pilgrims. . . . . The principal temple itself is a very plain, unpretending edifice, and evidently of great antiquity, though not quite so old as the priests and devotees pretend. According to the latter, the Sun Goddess was born in it and dwelt in it, and on that account it has never been enlarged, improved, or in any way altered. Among the priestesses of the temple, there is almost always a daughter of a spiritual emperor.

'"Orthodox Sintonists," says Kämpfer, "go in pilgrimage to Isye once a-year, or at the very least once in their lifetime; nay, it is thought a duty incumbent on every true patriot, whatever sect or religion he otherwise adheres to, and a public mark of respect and gratitude which every one ought to pay to the Sun Goddess, as to the protectress, founder, and first parent of the Japanese nation. . . . . This pilgrimage is made at all times of the year; but the greatest concourse of people is in their three first months, March, April, and May, when the season of the year and the good weather make the journey very agreeable and pleasant. Persons of all ranks and qualities, rich and poor, old and young, men and women, resort thither; the lords only of the highest quality, and the most potent princes of the empire excepted, who seldom appear there in person.

'"An embassy from the emperor is sent there once every year, in the first month, at which time also another with rich presents goes to Miaco with presents to the ecclesiastical hereditary monarch. Most of the princes of the empire follow the emperor's example."'—*Ibid.* pp. 211—213.

We cannot say, however, that when we read that the certificate of having appeared at the sacred shrine is considered as a plenary remission, and that in the available form of a piece of printed paper it is sold, with all its virtues, to all who can afford to pay for it, and who do not choose to go to the expense in time and trouble of a personal visit to Isye, we are forcibly

reminded of the abuses connected with the system of indulgences.

What the ordinary writers on Japan think proper to call religious orders and monasteries, are only the Buddhist Lamacovics, which the readers of our recent paper on M. Huc's Travels are not likely to have forgotten. A society of female devotees, whom Kämpfer thinks proper to compare with the nuns, or at least, Beguines of Europe, 'of no particular faith, and of very doubtful morality,' much more pointedly resembles the devotees of Mylitta in the temples of Babylon.

Japan, however, like China, seems to have passed its culmination. In religion, as well as in arts, these great mysterious countries are on the decline. The popular superstitions seem to have a very slight hold on the vulgar mind; Buddhism has the strongest, but, perhaps, because it is a double system, presenting a vague Pantheizing philosophy for the initiated, and the most sordid idolatry for the lower classes. The accounts seem to combine in representing the apparently inconsistent facts, that all religious persons, priests and the like, are the objects of popular ridicule and contempt, and yet that the temples and shrines are well attended, and supplied with pecuniary support. It is even doubtful whether, in the extreme East, an individual ever prays, or has any personal belief in God; his religion is simply and nakedly vicarious; it is the business of the priest, or Lama, to pray for him, or to grind out prayers in the Thibetan Prayer-mill. If he pays for this he thinks that he may safely despise the instrument of his devotions; so long as he gets his religion done for him, he has no further concern with it. In some such way as this, the conflicting accounts which we read of Chinese and Japanese religion, must be understood; for it is common in popular works to describe them both as a religious people, and as entire atheists.

It would be quite superfluous in this place to give any detail of the philosophic religion of Japan—the *Suto* or 'way of the philosophers'—because it is only the abstract and mystical esoteric Buddhism, which, perhaps, scarcely differs from the Indian and kindred Pantheism. The high spiritualistic Oriental philosophers differ rather in terminology, and not much in that, than in ideas. They believe, generally, or affect to believe, in a universal soul and spirit, sustaining but not creative, which is diffused through the universe and animates all things, which absorbs souls and intelligences as the ocean receives the rivers and waters. This is the philosophic faith which the educated classes in Japan, as throughout the East, affect to hold. They conform to the popular religious observances by way of exam-

Digitized by Google

ple, and as thinking it better that the vulgar should profess, or conform to idolatry, rather than to nothing.

The public worship of Buddhism is well described by Mr. Fortune in his elegant and instructive volume, 'The Tea Districts of China:'—

'Anxious to see the whole of the Buddhist service, I took my station at one of the passages leading to the large temple a few minutes before the priests assembled. I had not been there long before an old priest walked past me to a huge block of wood, carved in the form of a fish, which was slung from the roof of one of the passages. This he struck several times with a wooden pole, and a loud hollow sound was given out which was heard over all the building. The large bronze bell in the belfry was now tolled three times; and the priests were observed coming from all quarters, each having a yellow robe thrown over his left shoulder. At the same time an old man was going round, beating on a piece of square board, to awake the priests who might be asleep, and to call the lazy ones to prayer.

'The temple to which the priests were hurrying, was a large building, fully 100 feet square, and about 60 feet in height. Its roof was supported by numerous massive wooden pillars. Three large idols—the Past, the Present, and the Future, each at least 30 feet in height—stood in the middle of the temple. An altar was in front of them, and more than a hundred hassocks were on the floor in front of the altar for the priests to kneel on during the service. Ranged on each side of this spacious hall were numerous idols of a smaller size, said to be the representatives of deified kings, and other great men, who had been remarkable for piety during their lifetime.

'Entering with the priests, I observed a man lighting the candles placed upon the altar, and burning incense. The smoke of the incense as it rose in the air filled the place with a heavy yet pleasing perfume. A solemn stillness seemed to pervade the temple. The priests came in one by one, in the most devout manner, scarcely lifting their eyes from the ground, and arranged themselves on the right and left sides of the altar, kneeling on the hassocks, and bending down lowly several times to the idols. Again the large bell tolled,—slowly and solemnly at first, then gradually quicker; and then everything was perfectly still.

'The priests were now all assembled, about eighty in number, and the services of the temple began. I took a seat near the door. The priest nearest to the altar now rang a small bell, another struck a drum, and the whole eighty bent down several times upon their knees. One of them then struck a round piece of wood, rather larger than a man's skull, and hollow inside, alternately with a large bronze bell. At this stage of the ceremonies, a young priest stepped out from amongst the others, and took his station directly in front of the altar, bowing lowly and repeatedly as he did so. Then the hymn of praise began. One of the priests, apparently the leader, kept time by beating upon the hollow piece of wood, and the whole of the others sang or chanted the service in a most mournful key. At the commencement of the service, the priests who were ranged in front of the altar, half on the right side and half on the left, stood with their faces to the large images. Now, however, they suddenly wheeled round and faced each other. The chanting, which began slowly, increased in quickness as it went on, and when at the quickest part suddenly stopped. All was then silent for a second or two. At last, a single voice was heard to chant a few notes by itself, and then the whole assembly joined, and went on as before.

'The young priest who had come out from amongst the others now took

Digitized by Google

his station directly in front of the altar, but near the door of the temple, and bowed lowly several times upon a cushion placed there for that purpose. He then walked up to the altar with slow and solemn steps, took up a vessel which stood on it, and filled it with water. After making some crosses and gyrations with his hand, he sprinkled a little of the water upon the table. When this was done, he poured a little from the vessel into a cup, and retired slowly from the altar towards the door of the temple. Passing outside, he dipped his fingers in the water and sprinkled it on the top of a stone pillar which stood near the door.

'While this was going on the other priests were still chanting the service. The time of the music frequently changed:—now it was fast and lively,—now slow and solemn,—but always in a plaintive key. This part of the service being ended, all knelt lowly before the altar, and when they rose from their knees a procession was formed. The priests on the right of the altar filed off to the right, and those on the left to the left, each walking behind the other up the two sides of the spacious hall, and chanting as they went a low and solemn air, time being kept by the tinkling of a small bell. When the two processions met at the further end of the building, each wheeled round and returned in the same order as it came. The procession lasted for about five minutes, and then the priests took up their stations in front of the altar, and the chanting went on as before. A minute or two after this the whole body fell upon their knees, and sang for a while in this posture. When they rose, those on the left sang a part of the service by themselves, then knelt down. The right side now took up the chant, and, having performed their part, also knelt down. The left side rose again, and so they went on for ten minutes, prostrating themselves alternately before the altar. The remainder of the service was nearly the same as that at the commencement.

'This striking ceremony had now lasted for about an hour. During the whole time a thick screen had been hanging down in front of the large door, to keep out the sun's rays. Just before the conclusion of the service the curtain was drawn aside, and a most striking and curious effect was produced. Streams of ruddy light shot across the temple, the candles on the altar appeared to burn dimly, and the huge idols seemed more massive and strange than they had done before. One by one the priests slowly retired as solemnly as they came, and *apparently* deeply impressed with the services in which they had been engaged. Nearly all the priests adjourned to the refectory, where dinner was served immediately. The Buddhists eat no animal food; but they manage to consume a very large quantity of rice and vegetables. I have been perfectly astonished at the quantity of rice eaten by one of these priests at a meal. And yet, generally, they look poor and emaciated beings, which is probably owing as much to the sedentary lives which they lead as to the nature of their food.'—*Tea Districts of China*, pp. 304—309.

It has been said or thought, that the toleration of different sects is a promising omen for missionary work in Japan: and it has actually been proposed, should an entrance ever be forced or yielded in the great barrier against national intercourse which these singular islands have for so many centuries maintained, that the Christian Missionaries should place themselves under the protection of the spiritual Emperor. If, it is said, Christianity would come down from its transcendental and exclusive position, if it would renounce the right of total inde-

Digitized by Google

pendence, the cross might once more triumph over the centimanous deities of Buddhism. Now we are far from saying that the Portuguese mission was without its faults, or that we should not do well, did the occasion offer, entirely to avoid that interference with secular politics, which, sooner or later, becomes the bane of all Jesuit missions; and through which in Japan, the Church planted by Xavier fell. But there are two especial difficulties connected with any Japanese Mission. In recognising the government of the country, and in submitting to its ordinances, it is difficult to see how a mission could distinguish between the co-ordinate secular and ecclesiastical authorities. While the Mikado or Daïri claims to be the son and representative of Deity, so long as the spiritual Emperor is not only protector of the sects but himself inherits the theocracy, so long as an innate holiness is ascribed to his person, and so long as he claims to exercise the attributes of Divinity, the power of causing famine and pestilence, and the like, it seems all but impossible for any Christian Mission to recognise the Mikado at all, or his authority.

The separation of the state authority into two (theoretically) independent functions, and the necessity of recognising both, is then one especial difficulty in the way of evangelizing Japan; and it is one of recent growth, for in Xavier's days it had not taken its present definite form. Add to this that Christianity has been tried and rejected: an apostate country is harder to reclaim than a simply heathen one. The Gospel is a savour of death unto death. It is hoped, however, that if Christianity were presented with simpler rites, and in direct antagonism to that form of it against which the Japanese are so prejudiced, 'a troop of reformed missionaries might again have a chance of success:' so we are told; but we must not forget that Japan has received and rejected the Gospel, under Roman Catholic auspices: it has in the person of the Dutch seen something of its reformed aspect. If the one has repelled, the other would not be likely to attract, either the philosophizing from his supersensual contemplations, or the vulgar from his sensual idolatries. The Christians of Xavier's church might provoke a popular tumult, by insulting the *Dii minorum gentium* of Sintooism or Buddhism: all that the Japanese know of Christianity, under any other form, is that presented by the Hollanders, who helped the Japanese idolaters to massacre the Japanese Christians. These are ill omens for the evangelization of Japan; and though we do not, and dare not, for a single moment, doubt of the ultimate success of our own Church, in the great work of Oriental missions, if fairly presented in its

Digitized by Google

own principles, yet what has already been detailed of Japan will serve to show what especial hindrances it must encounter, if the work of planting the cross in Niphon should be reserved for us,—or for our American brethren.

Of late years the subject of missions has been taken up with some better approaches to philosophy and common sense. But we shall never succeed in Missions, if we suppose that an ordinary gentleman, of less than ordinary capacity, with nothing to offer to the subtle professors of Brahmanism and Buddhism, than the Bible, and the Prayer Book, with its unvarying ritual, constructed for England, and English tastes, will make the least impression on the great Oriental mind. Few of our readers have, perhaps, realized the vastness of the system to be attacked; Buddhism and Brahmanism combined far exceed in numerical strength Christianity under its varied forms. The statistics of religion combine in representing Buddhism alone as nearly equalling the Gospel in point of numbers: some accounts give Buddhism a clear superiority. The ordinary computation of the population of the globe, according to religious profession—we take that adopted by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel—is:—

Christians	260,000,000
Jews	4,000,000
Mahometans	96,000,000
Idolaters of all sorts . .	500,000,000=860,000,000

This table does not vary very fatally from the more scientific enumeration furnished by Mr. Keith Johnstone, in his 'Physical Atlas,' which, adopting the above method of division, would stand thus:—

Christians	286,000,000
Jews	5,500,000
Mahometans	116,000,000
Idolaters	484,000,000=891,000,000

It is frightful, however, to remember, that this awful aggregate of the sum of idolaters, is made up, according to Mr. Johnstone, in particulars of—

Buddhists	245,000,000
Brahmanists	133,000,000
Pagans	106,000,000=484,000,000

An unauthoritative and anonymous table, given by Mr. Mac Farlane, shows still more alarming proportions: we believe them to be an exaggerated statement of Oriental religion:—

Mahometans	252,000,000
Buddhists	315,000,000
Brahmanists.	111,000,000

Digitized by Google

But anyhow, we have nearly four hundred millions of religionists not strictly worshippers of wood and stone, but under its Brahmanical and Buddhistic varieties, professors of a religion which claims to have a deep and commanding philosophy, which numbers educated and thoughtful men in its ranks, which is old, venerable, full of great associations, and abounding in lofty pretensions. Against all this we have to offer Christianity, externally crippled, and internally weakened by divisions. In the plenitude of his heathen scorn, when the Japanese emperor was once asked to proscribe Christianity, he replied, 'We have 'already thirty-four sects of our own; the Christians will make 'the thirty-fifth; this will do no great harm; let them remain.' But when Christianity is next proffered to the proud feudality of Japan, it will not be in the shape of a thirty-fifth faith, one compact and intelligible, but in the perplexing form of twice thirty-five denominations of Christians, repeating with exaggerations the terrible warning of the strife between Portuguese and Dutch. The enmity between two bodies of Christian professors destroyed Japanese Christianity once; what we have next to try is, whether the Japanese will be indifferent to the sight of eight or ten rival Missions, all proclaiming the Gospel, and all 'thoroughly convinced,' and thoroughly proclaiming their convictions, 'of the difference between the Church of Rome, and the reformed Churches.' To this obstacle we must reconcile ourselves as we may; it is one common in days of division, to every Church, and to 'all denominations;' it is no especial hindrance to the Church of England. We make up our minds to it, and expect it, and fight it as we can. All that we can do is either to face it, or to abandon missionary work altogether.

There remain, however, certain specialties, which account for the little success which our recent Missions have had in grappling with the Oriental mind. We do not undervalue the Tinnevelly successes, and the like; they are, however, recent and partial. And they, which is most thankworthy, show that 'the common people hear the Gospel gladly.' But as regards the great labyrinth of Indian metaphysics, and Buddhist theosophy, have we penetrated even the outskirts of the jungle? What impression has been made upon those hundreds of millions of souls? Can we expect any impression? Passing by that deadliest curse upon missionary purposes, the evil lives of Christian professors, what machinery have we to grapple with the systematic unbelief of the East? What with Islam?

It is comparatively easy for very common-place people, and with very ordinary means, to displace Fetichism, or to substitute the worship of Almighty God for that of a black stone; but

Digitized by Google

confront a missionary of the ordinary 'Society'-stamp with a great religion, which professes the loftiest doctrines and the purest principles of abstract morality—which preaches the beauty and holiness of self-sacrifice—which inculcates the necessity of prayer without ceasing, and the deepest meditation upon spiritual mysteries—which is ascetic and charitable—which commands self-examination and the most minute watchfulness over every thought, and deed, and word, and work; and all that we can say is, that he requires a very different training from what among ourselves he receives. The foundation of S. Augustine's College has led to some expectations of an improved state of things. We believe that these expectations will not be disappointed; but beyond this admirable institution we have a right to scrutinise every quarter where aid can be legitimately demanded. There is a Sanscrit professorship, and there are Sanscrit scholarships at Oxford. It is not unfair to inquire, what assistance the Church has derived from these endowments, in coping with Buddhism in the strongholds of its influence and successes? We say it without bitterness or contempt; but what can be expected from a divine of the calibre of Bishop Smith, of Victoria, who has only signalised himself by squabbling with the American missionary bishop, Dr. Boone, about precedence and jurisdiction? What we want—and to supply the want we can never begin too early—is a body of men of the highest education, who shall be able to grapple with refined infidelity of the most specious forms in Benares, Canton, and Jeddo.

A story is told somewhere of a resolution, which some well-meaning persons came to for converting Southern India by a liberal distribution of Butler's Analogy in the vernacular, having failed by the preliminary difficulty of universal ignorance as to what was the Tamil for analogy. It is a fact, that after some years of Anglo-Saxon missions at Hong Kong, the American and English missionaries cannot settle, either for themselves or each other, the Chinese word for God, in its Christian sense. Such difficulties are not confined to a single theological term. The instance is adduced only to show that the very highest education, and the greatest intellectual powers of Europe, will be taxed, when they enter into controversy with the higher forms of Oriental religion.

Neither will it help the Missionary cause if the way to Jeddo is opened by British or American steamers and cannon. The Japanese, as a people, we believe, regret the policy which shuts their ports to European civilization and European trade. Much, however, as in their hearts they might welcome the downfall of

Digitized by Google

the moribund political system, which estranges Japan; we question whether the propagation of the Gospel would be benefited by its connexion with bloodshed and revolution. It is a misfortune that the English Church must be in Chinese eyes connected with the opium war; not a misfortune that the Bishopric of Victoria was founded as soon as we settled at Hong Kong; but a deep and abiding misfortune, that the first which was heard in so many Chinese provinces of England, was in connexion with the Nemesis, and 'the devil's ships.' The Gospel of Peace and a British broadside are hard things for the Chinese intellect to reconcile.

However, we are venturing on subjects perplexing, if not painful; we will therefore turn to a more promising aspect of the Japanese character, and, as it is connected with our last observations, some account of Japanese learning, and of the general diffusion of education, will not be out of place:—only premising that the Japanese language is monosyllabic,[1] that paper made of bark is said to have been used as early as the seventh century, and that the art of printing from engraved wooden blocks is some centuries older than its European invention or introduction.

'From the moment the Japanese acquired a written language, their literature advanced rapidly, and it appears to have improved from age to age. Unfortunately, in Europe, it is scarcely known; but from the few Japanese books that have fallen into the hands of learned foreigners, and from the accounts left us by the Missionaries and other travellers, it is evident that these people possess works of all kinds,—historical compositions, geographical and other scientific treatises, books on natural history, voyages and travels, moral philosophy, cyclopædias, dramas, romances, poems, and every component part of a very polite literature.

'The wide diffusion of education, which has been more than once mentioned, is of no recent date. The first of all the Missionaries who visited the country found schools established wherever they went. The sainted Xavier mentions the existence of four "Academies" in the vicinity of Miako, at each of which education was afforded to between three and four thousand pupils; adding, that considerable as these numbers were, they were quite insignificant in comparison with the numbers instructed at an institution near the city of Bandone; and that such institutions were universal throughout the empire.

'Nor does it appear that these institutions have decreased in modern days. Speaking of the early part of the present century, M. Meylan states that children of both sexes and of all ranks are invariably sent to rudimentary schools, where they learn to read and write, and are initiated into some knowledge of the history of their own country. To this extent, at least, it is considered necessary that the meanest peasant should be

[1] A Jesuit once said of it, that it must have been invented, and invested with the utmost difficulty by Satan himself, in order to drive poor Missionaries mad, and hinder the progress of the faith.

Digitized by Google

educated. Our officers, who visited the country as late as the year 1845, ascertained that there existed at Nagasaki a college, in which, additionally to the routine of native acquirements, foreign languages were taught. Among the visitors on board our ship, many spoke Dutch. Some understood a little French. One young student understood English slightly, could pronounce a few English words, caught readily at every English expression that struck him, and wrote it down in his note-book. They all seemed to be tolerably well acquainted with geography, and some of them appeared to have some acquaintance with guns, and the science of gunnery. The eagerness of all of them to acquire information greatly delighted our officers.

'The Japanese printers keep the market well supplied with cheap, easy books, intended for the instruction of children, or people of the poorer classes. The editions or impressions of books of a higher order appear to be uncommonly numerous. Most of these books are illustrated and explained with frequent woodcuts, which are engraved on the same wood-blocks with the type. Like the Chinese, they only print on one side of their thin paper. An imperial cyclopædia, printed at Miako, in the spiritual emperor's palace, is most copiously embellished with cuts.

'All are agreed that reading is a favourite resource and recreation with both sexes, and that the Dairi, or court of the Mikado, is eminently a bookish, literary court.

'It is said that few sights are more common in Japan, during the sunny seasons of the year, than that of a group of ladies and gentlemen seated by a cool running stream, or in a shady grove, each with a book in hand. Whatever their literature may be, it is evident that it delights them, and that it has polished their manners.'—*Mac Farlane's Japan*, pp. 372—375.

It is added, also, that every Japanese, of whatever rank, is sent to school. It is said that there are more schools in Japan than in any other country in the world; and that even the peasants and poorest persons can read;—that, contrary to oriental practice, the minds of the women are equally cultivated with those of the men. Many of their authors are female; and travellers are enthusiastic in praise of their courtly manners and refinement. The national vice, among the men, is incontinence; but female chastity is in universal esteem. We conclude with an account of the national amusements, which presents very pleasing elements of a high and almost incredible civilization:—

'In the great world the young ladies find delight, at their social meetings, in every description of fine work, the fabrication of pretty boxes, artificial flowers, painting of fans, birds, and animals, pocket-books, purses, plaiting thread for the head-dress, all for the favourite use of giving as presents. Such employments serve to while away the long winter evenings. In the spring, on the other hand, they participate with eagerness in all kinds of out-door and rural amusements. Of these the choicest are afforded by the pleasure-boats, which, adorned with the utmost cost and beauty, cover their lakes and rivers. In the enjoyment of society and music, they glide in these vessels from noon till late in the night. . . .

'This is an enjoyment which can only be shared under the advantages of such a climate and scenery; viz. the climate of Nice and the scenery of

Digitized by Google

Lugano. Their lakes and rivers are, after sunset, one blaze or illumination, as it were, with the brightly-coloured paper lanterns displayed in their vessels. They play meanwhile that game with the fingers, which has been perpetuated from classic times in Italy. A floating figure is also placed in a vase of water; as the water is stirred by the motion of the boat, the figure moves. The guests sing to the guitar the strain "Anataya modamada,"—"He floats, he is not still," till at last the puppet rests opposite some one of the party, whom it sentences to drain the sackee bowl, as the pleasing forfeit of the game. All this stands out in cheerful contrast to the dull debaucheries of the men, and the childish diversions of the women, among other oriental nations. The female sex, at least, have greatly the advantage over the scandal of the Turkish bath; and the man has, equally with the Turk, the resource of his pipe, in the intervals of those better enjoyments which the admission of the female sex into society affords him, and which are prohibited to the Mussulman.

'Assuredly, these are captivating, delicious pictures of life and manners.'—*Ibid.* pp. 329—331.

Digitized by Google

NOTICES.

MR. MASTERS has projected a new series—generally speaking, a new series is not much in favour with us—of which we augur well. It is to be devoted to biography: not, as it seems, so much in the way of a Hagiography, but in a more practical and simple form. Dismissing legend, the lives proposed are to be rather those of practical persons, living in historical times, and illustrating by their virtues the religious life. The notion is good, and it is one the value of which, very early in the revival, was pointed out by one concerned in it, and which has been very inadequately and partially fulfilled by Mr. Newman's 'Lives of the English Saints.' We presume that the present collection will be partly original and partly selected. The volume, well-known and valued, 'The Life of James Bonnell, Esq.,' appears as the first volume of the series. We could have wished another inauguration, as the book is rather dull, and is already on the S. P. C. K.'s list.

The able—unusually able—writer of the 'Restoration of Belief,' (Macmillan,) will not expect any judgment of ours in the present stage of his argument. By the way, we should, as a mere matter of literary moment, regret were this author's practice of fragmentary publication followed; and it is one which in previous works he has adopted: we mean that a theological argument ought not to be delivered to the public in instalments, like Mr. Dickens' stories. It is unjust both to reader and writer.

A vigorous 'Sermon on Church Music,' (Masters,) by Mr. Gresley, has caught our attention. The preacher does not talk at random: and when he says from experience, that 'the choral service is one of the most effectual instruments for the conversion of sinners as well as for the perfection of saints,' (p. 10,) some prejudices ought to be arrested if not removed.

Mr. Bennett's 'Second Letter to Lord John Russell, in which some Debates in the last Parliament are considered,' (Cleaver,) most persons will think out of time. Mr. Bennett might either have met Mr. Horsman's attacks simultaneously with their appearance, or have left him where the session left him—in ignominy. To review the matter now is, we think, superfluous. We speak only of the time, not of the substance, of the publication, with most of which we are in general accord. To abridge the right of English Churchmen to attend foreign services is a purism as hypocritical as mischievous. But when Mr. Bennett goes on to say that it is absolutely unlawful to attend the worship of the so-called English chaplains in cities and towns where the Catholic Church in another branch is legally settled and has jurisdiction, many will part company with his argument. Admitting, for a moment, that the letter of the ancient Canons is with Mr. Bennett, yet it is obvious to observe that they were constructed during the entirety of a state of things which has ceased. As a fact, the gift of unity, external unity, has been withdrawn: as a fact, Mr. Bennett at least admits, the grace of sacraments survives in the fragments

Digitized by Google

of the broken Church. What then we have to seek for in the ancient Canons is whether any principle is contained in them which might meet the present state of things were it known, or could it have been known, to antiquity. The letter of antiquity does not help us. The royalty of Judah was simply forbidden in the old law, yet it was divinely recognised. Theocratic regulations then became, from the necessity of the case, suspended; they were of force as principles, not in details. They were modified by facts, though those facts were exceptional and anomalous, and had been proscribed. Here then is a state of things not provided for, which required an adaptation of the old letter. It would have been sin in a pious Israelite to have refused obedience to David, because theocracy was the unabrogated divine institution. Here is an actual case in Sacred History, which may lead us to understand how a broken and divided Church, though never contemplated, may, in the counsels of God, legitimately suspend certain canonical rules, which were not essentially normal, but only by accident imperative before the division, and which cannot therefore be binding in particulars under a new but false, yet permitted, state of things. Mr. Bennett is most happy and ingenious in his use of the attendance on foreign services by Dr. Townsend, Mr. Stowell, and their friends. We could have helped him to a more decisive instance: we once saw a prominent Protestant and English dignitary not only present at a Roman Catholic baptism, but hold a taper during the service. But Mr. Bennett does not get over the theoretical inconsistency: he, while abroad, regularly ministered in prayers and sacraments to himself and his own domestic party and personal friends, apart from the Roman Communion and Church. Any nomadic Chaplain may take the hint that his flock are for the time to him what Mr. Bennett's friends and companions were to him. We do not say that there is no distinction, but it is not one of canonical order. And this we say, even while admitting that English chapels on the continent are most objectionable—much in theory, but more in fact—and yet more, assuming that it is not a matter of clerical obligation to attend them.

Mr. Chancellor Harington's able argument against the Nag's Head Fable, 'The Succession of Bishops unbroken,' (Rivingtons,) has reached a second edition.

We are not exactly aware what unoccupied ground Mr. Whitaker's new Monthly Magazine, 'The Christian Student,' proposes to cover. If, however, it has a distinct aim and fulfils it, and it certainly desires to do so loyally, we shall sympathise with its success.

We select from single sermons two of especial merit; 'Christian Unity a Practical Christian Duty,' by Mr. Harness, of Knightsbridge, and 'Cost an Element of Sacrifice,' by Mr. Philip Hale, preached at Camberwell. (Whitaker.) Mr. Harness' sermons are an admirable specimen of style as well as substance, and why they are 'not published' we cannot conceive. Mr. Hale is known as an active and very diligent worker; he has done much, and attempted more, for Tenison's (mismanaged) Library, which is under his care. We are glad to welcome him as a parochial teacher.

The great dispute which is raging in the daily papers on the stability [illegible] solvency of Life Assurance Institutions, would seem to be one little

Digitized by Google

calculated for discussion in these pages. But, from experience, we know how sedulously the secretaries and touters for new policies set upon the clergy. There are, perhaps, more insurances effected on clerical lives than on those of any other class of British subjects: and, for various reasons, the clergy are more likely to be imposed upon. They know little of business, and from their small means are disposed to close with the offer of small premiums. We do not go to the extent of saying that no new offices are safe: but we say this distinctly,—that offices with the very largest business, and of the most confirmed security, are enabled to do little more than justice to the assured. But the expenses necessary for a small office, though they do not equal, yet approximate to, those of the largest. It follows, then, that if two offices could do all the business which it is now proposed to spread over twenty, eighteen twentieths of the business expenses are in fact contributed at the risk of the assured. In other words, offices which are unnecessary, are dangerous. That many of the existing concerns are insolvent there can be no question: if our advice, therefore, on such a subject is of any weight, we recommend the older Institutions. At any rate, before a young clergyman insures his life, let him read Mr. Christie's 'Letter to Mr. Henley,' (Edinburgh: Constable.)

Messrs. Longman have published a collection of 'Rounds and Catches,' which we welcome heartily. Everybody knows, and when they try to sing them everybody finds that everybody does not know, the traditional 'Three Blind Mice,' and 'White sand and grey sand,' &c. This cheap and unpretending publication supplies these and the like famous melodies within reach and within voice of all. Surely Harington's famous 'Twas you, Sir, 'twas you, Sir,' wears a new, and, we do not mind owning, uncalled-for adaptation in this collection. As a whole it bears evidence of unpretending research: at any rate, it brings together what was needed—the scattered tunes which no other publication, to our knowledge, has done, at least in this cheap form.

'De Zangschool: Keus van Gezangen voor de School en het Leven: door H. B. Waterkleyn, Professor te Leuven. Thienen: by P. J. Merckx. (*The Song School: Songs for School and Life: by H. B. Waterkleyn, Professor at Louvain.* Tirlemont: P. J. Merckx.) This is a rather curious example of the vernacular efforts which Rome is making in every part of Europe. It was not to be expected that Mechlin, one of her best regulated dioceses, should be behind-hand in the work; and it is highly creditable to the zeal of the Professors of Louvain that one of them should have become the 'Watts' of the movement. Here, for two-pence, we have thirty songs, with their music; the latter partly consisting of national melodies, partly of German airs. Here is a specimen of the words—the striking analogy between Flemish and English may interest such of our readers as have never seen the former language:—

'Ik geloof in God den Vader
Die door t' Woord geschapen heeft
Aerde en Hemel, en te gader
Al wat is, en al wat leeft:
En in Zynen een'gen Zone,
Jesus-Christus, onzen Heer;
Die uit's Hemels hoogen troone
Is gedaeld ter aerde neêr.'

'I believe in God the Father
Who, through the Word, shaped has
Earth and Heaven, and together
All that is, and all that lives:
And in His only Son,
Jesus Christ, our Lord,
Who, from Heaven's high throne
Is come down to earth.'

Digitized by Google

The thoroughly Wesleyan cadence of another hymn is really remarkable :—

> 'U minnen, Maria, gedenk ik altyd.
> Myn heet zy, Maria, op nieuw U gewyd !
> Wees myne bescheomster, Maria zoo rein !
> O ! wees myne moeder, uw kind wil ik zyn.'

Having mentioned the Diocese of Mechlin (and that of Liége, under its late excellent Bishop, was at least on a par with it), we cannot but express our admiration of the indefatigable energy which the Cardinal Primate Sterckx throws into the affairs of his Church. One day we find his imprimatur to the noble Gregorian music which Hanicq is so incessantly pouring forth; next day, to one of the 'Little Catechisms of Malines,' which are beginning to be regarded as catechetical models in north-western Europe; directly afterwards, to a new volume of the *Theologia ad usum Seminarii Mechliniensis :* then, again, to such a most needful little book as *Instructions sur la manière de Baptiser les Enfants Nouveau-nés à l'usage des Accoucheurs et des Sages-Femmes*, approved also by the medical faculty of Louvain; and presently afterwards to its Flemish counterpart. Such energy contrasts strangely enough with the majority of Episcopal operations in England.

'Strife for the Mastery,' (Murray,) is the title of two Allegories. They are sumptuously printed, and excellently illustrated by some wood-cuts exhibiting rare artistic powers in an amateur. The tales themselves—but we have said our say about allegories, and if ladies will write them we are only glad that they embody principles as good as those in the volume before us.

'Sunlight in the Clouds,' (Mozley.) Much of what we have just said applies to this volume. It is a collection of religious tales written with considerable pathos and entire good taste. The successive appearance of such volumes, and so good, answers the difficulty that the market may be overstocked. If it were, they would not appear; and that they are in demand is in itself a good sign.

Bishop Forbes' 'Explanation of the Nicene Creed,' (Masters,) aims high, and secures its aim. Into a small and unassuming compass much of pure dogmatic theology is compressed, and we know no English work which fulfils the same object. We should have preferred a somewhat more technical form. The work is for students, and students ought always to be reminded that they are not perusing an essay or a disquisition, but mastering settled points. Systematic theology should not be presented in the essay form. If a stiff arrangement cannot escape the look of formality it is a step towards accuracy. We thank the writer for his acceptable publication.

Mr. William Jackson has brought together, into a single volume, his 'Stories and Catechising Illustrative of the Collects,' (Mozley.) The notion was ingenious, and we have spoken favourably of the series as it has progressed—to use an Americanism, which it seems impossible to eradicate from popular use. We are really quite surprised at the skilful variety which the illustrator has thown on a subject apparently unpromising.

There is much that is calm and pleasing about Mr. Isaac Williams'

Digitized by Google

'Biography of Mr. R. A. Suckling, of Bussage,' (Masters.) The interest derived from the treatment of the subject, perhaps exceeds that of the subject itself. Still, Mr. Suckling's was the type of a life which ought to be known—with nothing great or striking about it, incapable of exercising a large influence on society, yet doing a great work, and the greater because the less prominent. Still quiet landscapes have a very important share in the great economy of things. The world is made up of unromantic home scenes. Mr. Suckling moved and worked among such. His power was over individuals, and by example; and his character was one of remarkable personal influence. It is well that the Church and the world should, by occasional pictures of such a life, be reminded of its secret but more efficient strength. Where it must be the exception to rival the saint or the hero of the Gospel, the life of the soldier trains while it teaches.

To criticise a book which everybody has read and formed a judgment upon seems quite superfluous; and to give an opinion on 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' may be thought an unnecessary intrusion. No reviewer can superciliously set aside the public verdict, and a book which sells by its hundred thousands must have some value, and some influence for good or for evil. As a work of art we cannot give a high estimate of Mrs. Stowe's production. With the single exception of St. Clair, which stands out with remarkable prominence as something like a definite moral conception, there is not a character which is not common-place and second-hand to a degree. There is a coldness and rigidity in the execution which betrays the copyist. The pathos of the tale is of a low order, because founded chiefly on the physical emotions. Uncle Tom is simply tedious; Legree unnatural; and St. Clair's wife only the typical fine lady of the circulating library. In depicting scenery the authoress fails; in drawing character, she makes the dramatic error of representing a class by its extreme cases. The Creole who reaches Canada is not above the melodramatic hero of a very minor theatre. And perhaps the most original sketch—that of Topsie—not uninfluenced by the exquisite creation of Fenella, and unpleasantly recalling a trace even of Undine, is entirely marred by her dismal and impossible mission as a Sunday-school teacher in Liberia. Of course, as answering a purpose which has a political as well as a humane end, the coarse brush and unscrupulous induction of Mrs. Stowe have told wonderfully; and there is quite enough of powerful writing, and a dangerous facility in agglomerating horrors, to account for much of its unquestionable, and, with serious deductions, its deserved success. A system which, even in a single case, can, without a violation of the statute law, produce these results, is of course simply accursed; but, even on Mrs. Stowe's statement, most of the cruelty depicted was, even in the Southern States, illegal. As a picture of the Slave-State life, it is exactly as true as a Borgia is a fair specimen of Christianity. This we hold to be a moral fault in a writer: and, to go further and to extend, as this book seems to do, the fact of American depravity in the treatment of slaves, as a proof of the absolute and entire unlawfulness of slavery—say in its Oriental form—is to betray a bad logic of the heart rather than the head. The curiosity of the book to ourselves is the strange picture it gives of Negro religion; but, from Mrs. Stowe's untrustworthiness in class painting, we know not how far she has drawn

Digitized by Google

species from a variety, or even, to speak botanically, from a monster. As to the religious profession of the authoress, we fancy that we detect a serious error—it is that of making every charitable person a redeemer of others, by vicarious suffering; this is of course a subtle form of developed Socinianism. This is called 'the Christ-like character,' and is the repetition by man of, or rather his substitute for, the work of redemption. Our readers will not have missed this as the leading idea of Longfellow's 'Golden Legend.'

'Walks after Wild Flowers, or the Botany of the Bohereens,' (Van Voorst,) is by 'Mr. Richard Dowden (Richard).' This reduplication puzzles us. A more delightful monograph of the Botany of a single locality (Cork) it would be impossible to conceive: the writer's profuseness of quotation and illustration, chiefly poetical, is embarrassing, from its richness. Mr. Dowden is equally generous in his general anecdotes. Kindliness of character, a healthy and genial estimate of the moral value of a naturalist's studies, and a glowing, reverential feeling towards 'Him who has so clothed the flowers of the field,' belong to all the writers whom Mr. Van Voorst so pleasantly introduces to us. His publications are among the most delightful of the day, even to unscientific readers; and our Irish botanist takes a good rank in his publisher's corps. Some, indeed several, inaccuracies in the Latin and Greek, as we are disposed to be uncritical, we shall attribute to the press.

Mr. Evans' Sermons, preached at S. Andrew's, Wells Street, are styled 'Christianity in its homely Aspects,' (Masters.) Passing over the exact propriety of the phrase 'homely' as equivalent, which it is not, to domestic or personal, Mr. Evans' written sermons scarcely convey the familiar aspect which belongs to them in delivery. This volume is anything but a plain one; it is original and interesting—highly so—but not homely, in any sense. Mr. Evans' mind is rich in illustration; and he is pointed in expression, with a considerable range of thought; and the collection is far above the average. But his cast of character leads to occasional exaggeration: *ex. grat.* after p. 168, pointing out clearly and well the peculiar force of the remarkable expression, 'a weaned child,' he goes on with this language, and we question whether it can be reconciled with physiological, or rather physical, facts: 'So soon as the child is weaned, the idea of separate existence is conveyed to his tender mind; the child feels that himself is not his mother .... he begins to infer,' &c. We doubt the fact: infant consciousness is a mysterious subject; but the use of technical words, such as ideas, comparison, and inference, suggests that we have mastered the difficulty. If Mr. Evans has done so, he is in advance of masters in mental philosophy.

We have received from Mr. Darling, so well known for his Theological Reading Library, the first number of a work of considerable promise and immense research, 'Cyclopædia Bibliographica.' It is a catalogue of theological writers, with a brief account of their works. A 'Cave,' modern as well as ancient, a 'Watt,' English and foreign. It seems to be most rich and explicit in recent literature, and is conducted with an especial regard to sermon-making, as in the case of a volume of sermons the text of each is given. All the pamphlets of living writers are faithfully chro-

Digitized by Google

nicled. We observe very few errors: one is, that our contemporary, Mr. Armstrong, appears twice, as of Exeter and of Tidenham. We wish the undertaking, and it is an important one, all success.

We cannot be so charitable as to impute the blunders in Mr. Stark's 'History of the Bishopric of Lincoln' (Longmans) to any other cause than that of entire ignorance of the languages which he professes to translate. There is much information in the volume; and Mr. Stark has been well assisted. But we do protest against the presumption of writing, or assuming to write, a work founded upon ancient documents without the slightest knowledge of Latin. The book is in its present state a disgrace to literature. *Ille Missa Est*, p. 64. Ac post Romani usque perrexit et per longum spatium ibidem mansit ad legendum scrutandeque mysteriæ Dei, Sanctasque perearrit Scripturas, p. 180. Habitu in veta monachi insignes, p. 185. Juxta ritus Lindisfarnensem, p. 215. Peada princeps Mediterranean Anglorum, p. 216. Pro omni a quitonali parte Britanniæ, p. 284. Every page betrays the same ignorance.

Mr. Gresley has reprinted an Essay on 'Confession, Penance, and Absolution,' by Mr. Roger Laurence, a Layman of Queen Anne's time. (Masters.) It is designed, we presume, as a supplement to this writer's able 'Essay on Confession,' which we have already commended. Mr. Gresley is of course aware that Laurence was consecrated a Bishop in one of the non-juring lines, and that he is the author of the work on 'Lay Baptism.'

'Romanism, an Apostate Church,' by Non Clericus, (Longmans,) represents a style of book which we thought we had outlived. A glance at the index will give a sufficient notice of this Florilegium: 'Romanism a curse to the world—Tractarians and Sleepy Bishops—No peace for England while a Popish Cardinal remains here—Why lags behind a certain Oxford Doctor?—Letters of Mr. Dodswell [sic] to the Oxford Doctor—Father Spencer—Father (!) Wilberforce—Rome's inculcations the dreams of a maniac,' &c. The author 'reposes confidence in our [late] noble Premier,' (p. 35.) He assures us that 'the whole Protestant population are sleeplessly alive to the future. Lord John Russell stands enwreathed on a pinnacle.' This unpleasant and unsafe position which we find that his Lordship occupied accounts more satisfactorily than any other reason we have met with for the fall of the late government.

Lieut. Burton's 'Falconry in the Valley of the Indus,' (Van Voorst,) is nicely illustrated. But though it contains some amusement, it is offensively and flippantly written, aiming at wit which it never reaches—a remarkably bad copy of 'Eothen.'

Mr. George Gorham, Scholar of Trin. Coll. Cambridge, has printed his Burney Prize Essay on 'the Eternal Duration of Future Punishment,' &c. (Deighton.) It is dedicated to Mr. Gorham, sen. of Brampford Speke, the essayist's father. That a young man has treated this subject with the learning and thought evinced by Mr. Gorham deserves great praise. It is a production full of promise.

Digitized by Google

The close of the Jubilee celebrated by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* in Westminster Abbey, was exactly the sort of subject to call out the Bishop of Oxford's oratorical powers. In his sermon preached on that occasion, 'The Shouts and Weeping of a Day of Jubilee,' (Rivingtons,) the Bishop has sustained his reputation; but the sermon, as might have been expected, told more in delivery than in its authorized form.

To complete the case as regards the Sisters of Mercy and their establishment at Plymouth, we must call attention to Captain Sellon's affecting and positive 'Contradiction,' &c. (Masters,) founded chiefly upon documentary evidence. The recent and distressing investigation in Mr. Prynne's case is only a separate proof of the rancour with which Church principles are assailed, and, we regret to say, by the Clergy in this place.

The author of 'The Coming Man' (Green) has got hold of a vague and illiterate notion, that Scripture and the complexion of the times seem conjointly to indicate some great and serious apostasy. But whether the 'falling away' shall be developed in a system or an individual—a philosophy or an empire—he does not seem to have settled. He is clearly perplexed about the matter. Possibly some sectarian views, or, more probably, sheer ignorance, have kept him from the doctrine of a personal Antichrist. But in the case of a person well-meaning, though distressingly ignorant both of science and reason, we can only regret that an acquaintance with settled theology has been denied him.

Mr. Benson's 'Sermon on Christian Education,' preached at S. James's, Westminster, (Skeffington,) interested us for more reasons than one. It treats ably, and in excellent language, the subject of education on first principles. This is now an uncommon mode of treating the subject. Mr. Benson's sermon has somewhat the value of a noble fossil. In this way wrote—we know this from sad experience; and in this way preached—happily, this experience has been denied us—the great English preachers, Tillotson and Balguy, Atterbury and Clarke: such as were these silver-tongued orators, such is Mr. Benson. Sentence after sentence rolls on like a procession; faultless in its members, correct, uniform, and apparently capable of scansion in its arrangements. Indisputable are the thoughts, for they are elementary, undeniable, and perfectly clear. Take an example. Mr. Benson, who keeps carefully to the broad path, is illustrating the necessity of education, because Christianity itself is a matter of instruction. The fact is elementary; the inference of the plainest. Here is about the most common-place thought that could suggest itself to an educated person; and yet how sonorous is Mr. Benson's exposition of this most undeniable truth:—

'For as to the religion of the Lord Jesus, men are not, in consequence 'of their fallen nature, at all likely, when left to the devices of their own 'hearts, either to study it with such careful impartiality, or so early in life, 'as is necessary to make it believed with that faith which worketh by love 'unto obedience. In their earliest youth they *could* not do this; nor 'unless taught to do so, *would* they do it at any time, before the lusts of the 'flesh, and of the eye, and the pride of life, had pre-occupied their minds, 'and led them into many acts of sin. And then their bias, by teaching

Digitized by Google

'them through their conscience that God's wrath was to be feared, would 'make them averse to look upon Him; and the hold that the flesh and the 'world's vanities had obtained over their heart, would, together with the 'habit of self-indulgence, make them most unwilling to take upon them the 'yoke of so pure, so spiritual, so self-denying a course of life, as that 'which the Gospel prescribes. Because their deeds were evil, they would 'not naturally come to the light that would reprove them. Before all 'things, therefore, in point o time as well as of importance, it is neces-'sary that, from their very infancy, the young should be taught the nature, 'truth, excellence, and duties, as well as privileges, of the Gospel.'

This is what the French would call the grand style: there is a breadth and massiveness in the ornate collocation of words which tells on the ear, if not on the intellect. This sort of sermon had its value physically, if not spiritually: it does not teach a single Christian duty, or animate to an evangelical act of sacrifice: but it soothes—it sweetens—it mollifies. It conduces to good temper, if not to good works. It asks no effort to comprehend, but it has a rich, grand, full, satisfying sound. We can quite understand the popularity of this sort of sermon. As we have said, it has a virtue of a literary kind: it dignifies platitude, and is thoroughly respectable and solemn. And we are by no means satisfied that, in the way of sermons, we have made a good exchange in the new style of empty sermons. If we are to have empty sermons, we like the old vacuity better than the new. When a preacher has nothing to say, we like his nothing clothed in good grammar, and choice language, and an elegant style. But when a preacher has nothing to say, and pours his nothing out in the vulgar, familiar style—half conversation, half cant,—of a more recent class of sermons, we must say that we look with regret to the eighteenth century preachers. They were insufferably dull, but they had a respectable well-to-do dulness. Our preachers are as dull as their predecessors, and as empty and threadbare; but then they display their vulgarity with a forward, pretentious, swaggering air. The last century preachers were like decayed gentlemen: the present popular preachers are of the avowed mendicant class. We will illustrate our meaning from a recent volume of sermons. There is no occasion to specify the writer's name, as we are engaged with a style and system, rather than with individuals: it will be enough to say that he has won high promotion, and, as it is said, mainly by his 'pulpit-powers.' Besides, the talk has been talked a thousand times.

'It may be there are some here to-day, who still cling to their own 'righteousness, and think it more glorious to be saved by their own doings 'than by the righteousness and blood of Jesus. To such I can only say, 'If you still continue thus wilfully ignorant of God's righteousness, the 'Lord of Hosts is not a crown of glory unto you, nor will be till you sub-'mit yourselves unto the righteousness of God. But, thanks be to His 'holy Name, there are others who can join with the Apostle, and say, '"God forbid that I should glory," &c. But believe me, dear brethren, if 'any such are here, and I trust there are, it requires a deep and abiding 'conviction of the reality of these things, to enable the believer to glory 'in the cross of Christ. Oh! may He more and more unite us to Him-'self,' &c.

Digitized by Google

This is a fair example of the popular Evangelical sermon: it is the sum and substance of this class of teaching. The terms are scarcely varied; but this is the theme which is repeated week after week where 'the Gospel' is said to be exclusively preached. If the passage conveys any meaning, its obvious one is, that righteousness is wrong. For did the preacher ever meet with one single person who 'thought it glorious to be *saved*' by 'righteousness?' which was, in fact, even to him, never presented as righteousness, or anything else of a religious character. But would such teaching as this ever attract or direct men to religious activity? Does it convey any meaning? Is it not rather a collection of religiously-sounding phrases disguising emptiness of thought? The danger of the old sermons was, that they substituted pleasing language for direct applied personal warning: the danger of the latter is, that religious words stand in the place of religious actions.

A third class of sermon-emptinesses comes nearer home. Many Plain Sermons which we meet with are simply plain because they are without an idea. Plainness of this sort does no good. The simplest people must, if they are talked to at all, have not only articulately-sounding language addressed to them, but language which has a meaning and thought in it. A Sermon is not plain because it says nothing. English Sermons want a great reform. Orthodox or heterodox, they seem for the most part to labour under the same fault of having nothing to say.

The Convocation question has brought out a very sensible 'Letter to Mr. Walpole' from Mr. Harold Browne. (J. W. Parker.) We make one or two extracts, which will be more acceptable than our criticism:—

'3. It will perhaps be said, the Bench of Bishops can do everything that 'is wanted. But, in the first place, they have themselves felt the difficulty 'of their position, and the impossibility of agreeing in any measures of 'practical reform. From many causes, they cannot always have the most 'extensive practical knowledge of the Church. I may add, that an assembly 'of Bishops has never been the recognised and constitutional form of Synod 'in England. There is good reason to think that it was not the most primitive form. The Council held by the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) had 'certainly elders as well as Apostles present at it; and I doubt not had 'laymen too. The earliest provincial Synods appear to have been attended 'by all the three orders of the clergy; and though in later times only 'Bishops, or Bishops and important and dignified presbyters assembled, 'yet, the very theory of our Reformation being, that the Church should be 'restored to the greatest possible likeness to the Church of the very earliest 'ages, it is far more accordant with our principles, that a mixed Synod 'should legislate for us, than that Bishops only should have a voice in our 'councils.'—P. 9.

'5. And still, sir, I repeat it, we want something done; something more 'than private efforts and private benevolence can do. Our system, adapted 'for the wants of the sixteenth century, and untouched since the seventeenth, has become cramped, rigid, wooden. Expansion, elasticity, life 'must be infused into it, or it will not work, but will only grow rustier. Without, therefore, being blind to the dangers attending Convocation,

Digitized by Google

'since, under God, there seems no other plan of improving us available, 'why may we not at least be permitted to make trial of it, in trust that He 'whose presence still is with us, will say, "Peace, be still!" if waves or 'storms seem threatening to break over us?

'The newspapers have told us, that the inevitable tendency of Convo- 'cation will be to the disruption of the Church, and the destruction of that '"compromise" upon which the very existence of the national establish- 'ment has been permitted. For "compromise" allow us to read "com- 'prehension," and I trust the very opposite may prove to be the truth. 'Compromise is a word which sounds ominously like unfaithfulness to the 'truth; and if the Church of England stands upon that, it can be no true 'church, and had better fall. But I do hope and believe that, so far from 'the comprehensive character of the national Church being destroyed by 'Convocation, the practical reforms likely to be introduced by it will be 'calculated to conciliate and comprehend, not only the two great schools 'now but imperfectly united in the Anglican communion, but also some of 'the bodies which unhappy circumstances have hitherto estranged from us.

'I trust and hope that, for the present at least, no effort will be made 'to discuss points of doctrine, or anything materially and inevitably lead- 'ing to points of doctrine. The reforms we want are practical, not doc- 'trinal; for, divided as churchmen may be, all sides are happily agreed, 'that the doctrines of the Prayer Book are orthodox and evangelical.'— Pp. 10, 11.

'7. I will not trouble you, sir, with detailing the many measures which 'I think Convocation might debate on, and which might tend to unity 'rather than division. I will only mention, in passing, one or two more 'which seem to me real and obvious necessities.

'The providing some theological and pastoral instruction for the candi- 'dates for Orders is one. My impression, from somewhat considerable 'experience, is, that our university education, however excellent in itself, 'is insufficient to prepare men for the work of the ministry. They come 'from it raw and unsuited for the task they are to engage in. The quicken- 'ing of our missionary operations is another. Then, again, the putting 'forth an authorized collection of hymns for public worship. The want is 'felt so generally, that it needs no comment. Our Prayer Book, the 'guardian of truth amongst us for three hundred years, I should hope to 'see untouched and sacred; but some division of our services might very 'probably be desirable; and some short and earnest forms of prayer, for 'particular occasions, might be composed and authorized with much benefit. 'There is one more subject, and it is a very delicate one, which I shall venture 'to allude to. Individual exertions, however full of zeal and piety, have ren- 'dered Protestant nunneries, Sisters of Charity, unpopular amongst us. 'If such had been organized by the whole body of the Church—persons 'with no strong ties of domestic duty might have given themselves for 'a time, if not perpetually, to a more than commonly self-denying devo- 'tion, in tending those bodily and spiritual necessities of which our great 'towns present such a fearful accumulation. The Sisters of Mercy and 'Wesleyan Methodism are two opposite yet concurring witnesses to the 'wooden and unaccommodating condition of a synodless church. The one

Digitized by Google

'was an evangelical, the other an Anglo-Catholic movement. Both had 'good objects; both were full of zeal; both organized by persons of deep 'piety and fervent self-devotion. But the Methodists found no response, 'and so have long since separated from us. The Sisters of Mercy, isolated 'and suspected, have much to tempt them to leave us too. I am in no 'degree prepared to stand up in defence of the imprudence or extravagance 'which may have characterized either of these bodies, but I deeply regret 'that wherever unusual zeal presents itself we seem powerless to direct it 'rightly, but of hard necessity must cast it off.

'If, then, our gracious Sovereign, by the advice of yourself and your 'colleagues, and especially of that illustrious nobleman who is your leader, 'should be pleased to permit the two houses of Convocation to sit and 'deliberate, there are many practical subjects (and many more to which 'I have not alluded) which may well occupy its attention, without neces- 'sity for bringing in disputes on doctrinal differences. Of course, some 'fiery spirits may find their way into our assemblies; but there is no rea- 'son to fear that they should do more mischief in them than in Church 'Unions, at Exeter Hall, or in the meetings of our religious societies. Nay, 'there is good reason to hope that they will find in Convocation much more 'restraint than they can meet with elsewhere. I believe, too, that if the 'clergy be fully and truly represented, but very few, if any, of such spirits 'will be returned as their representatives.'—Pp. 18—20.

The value of Mr. Boothby Barry's 'Thoughts on the Renovation of Cathedral Institutions' (Ridgway) will now be tested by the Commission, which it is announced that the Government is prepared to issue. Mr. Barry's suggestions are not new, or where new, as, for instance, that service should be celebrated in the nave of the Cathedral, not desirable. Still his pamphlet condenses useful hints and reflections. By the way, we wish that scholars would remember that the term 'sinecure' is a technical one in ecclesiastical matters. It does not mean a preferment and income to which no duties are attached: but an ecclesiastical function to be exercised *sine curâ animarum*.

'A Few Words on the Progress of Socialism and Infidelity: a Letter addressed to the Earl of Shaftesbury,' (Rivingtons,) by Mr. Brudenell Barter, is one of the most calm and severe appeals, to one on whom every appeal embodying principles of moral truth and justice is thrown away, which we can recal.

A good cause, that of protesting against the absurd and wasteful fattening of cattle for prizes at the agricultural shows, would have stood a better chance in other hands than in those of the Rev. Henry Cole, B.D., who has addressed a 'Reflective Letter' (Seeleys) on the subject to the various patrons of these institutions. With Mr. Cole's position we entirely sympathise: but his style is very odd, especially in a schoolmaster. He thus describes a fat pig:—'The pitiable swine were so distorted by swollen 'obesity, that the shape of their heads as swine, to except the extreme 'nostril circle, could not possibly be traced. And as to the eye, it was utterly 'idden by large lumps of overlaying fat, which it appears had rendered 'm utterly blind for several of the last weeks of their inhuman pingui-

Digitized by Google

tion.' (P. 7.) One is tempted to inquire whether Mr. Cole desires porkers of human 'pinguition.' In his narration Mr. Cole, challenging, sensibly enough, the cattle-show people to prove that such a process of fattening is scientific, useful, or justifiable, uses this language:—'That the 'important and serious subject-point may not be lost . . . I would admonish 'the responding defender of these procedures,' &c. (P. 14.)

We cannot concur with Mr. Paul much further than in his amiable temper and good feeling. No contribution to the cause of 'Christian Union,' on which he has printed 'Six Sermons,' delivered at Blackheath, (Rivingtons,) can be passed over without sympathy and acknowledgment. We fear, however, that compromise rather than comprehension would be the result of this writer's suggestions. He fails to see that in some very important particulars, such as the constitution of the Church, the matters of discipline are matters of doctrine, and involve the purity of faith, once for all delivered to the saints.

We can never have an excess of such works as Mr. Stretton's 'Guide to the Infirm, Sick, and Dying,' (Masters.) It is not designed as a substitute for the valued 'Visitatio Infirmorum;' but is a more condensed, and, in its introductory part, a more literary work. It has been felt that some devotions to accompany the act of confession would be useful in such a manual. Different tastes require different aids; and it is a platitude to say, that a multiplication of such aids is an incontrovertible proof of the growing inner life of the Church.

A Review of the voluminous, and, we may be pardoned for saying, occasionally tedious, 'Reports of her Majesty's School Inspectors,' has been published by Messrs. Longman, under the title of 'Extracts from the Reports,' &c. It is specifically addressed to school managers not receiving Government aid;—by way of bait, we presume.

Mr. Sandham Elly has published a reply to the work, 'Quakerism, or the Story of my Life,' which it is announced is the work of Mrs. Greer. Mr. Elly's work is to come out in parts, of which we have seen No. I., under the title, 'Ostentation, or Critical Remarks,' &c. (Dublin: Hodges and Smith.) The reply, as far as it has gone, is destructive rather of the authoress than constructive of the systems which she attacks. We make the announcement because we reviewed the original work: not, as will be remembered, without distinct strictures on the writer's tone.

The clever and condensed history of England, which we have spoken well of under its unpretending title, 'Kings of England,' (Mozleys,) has reached its fourth edition, judiciously enriched with examination questions.

A Hymnal, from the same publishers, is far above the average; and to those who can reconcile themselves to the use of unauthorized hymns, entirely to be recommended. We ask for hymns, and we suffer loss by their absence from the public service. But whether this loss is so great as the danger of countenancing bad hymns by the surrender of the principle of authority, is a mooted point, and one of no little practical difficulty.

'Landmarks of Ancient History,' (Mozleys,) is by the author, or

Digitized by Google

authoress, of 'Kings of England,' and the care and accuracy which we have commended in the former we find in the present publication. A companion on Modern History is promised.

Mr. Jameson's 'Norrisian Essay on the Analogy between the Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture,' (Macmillan,) though clever, we thought too much in the style of sermons.

The 'Anticleptic Gradus,' [Anti-Crib, as schoolboys say,] (Rivingtons,) is one of Mr. Kerchever Arnold's useful school-books. Its value is in its richness and precision; it omits the collection of epithets, so useful to boys and so annoying to teachers in the old manual. The old Gradus ad Parnassum, if we remember, was a Jesuit production. It is quite a reflection on the Protestant institutes that they have so long allowed it to corrupt the hope of rising England.

We have received the second edition of Professor Archer Butler's 'Sermons.' (Macmillan.)

Mr. W. Spark, 'Organist and Choir-Master, Leeds,'—we presume at S. Peter's Church,—has just published (Novello) a 'Lecture delivered before the Yorkshire Architectural Society, on Choirs and Organs, their proper Position in Churches.' It is a cheering sign to observe the general attention paid to all ecclesiological questions. Mr. Spark seems very well intentioned, but a little too much inclined to the theory that services are made for organs. His ritual views are somewhat vague, as he is a patron of antiphonal services, but stickles at their being said in the chancel. We note with interest that he singles out the position of the organ in S. Mary Magdalene, Munster-square, as the most successful example he can adduce of the position of an organ near the choir and not in a gallery.

We have so frequently in these pages called attention, in various ways, to the 'Irvingite' theory of the Church—we use the word in no offensive sense, but simply because we can find no other—that we have perused with great interest the recently published 'History of the Christian Church' by Dr. Thiersch, son of the Greek Grammarian. Our excellent contemporary, the 'Theological Critic,' has commenced a translation, but Mr. Arnold has been forestalled by 'Mr. Carlyle, of the Scottish Bar,' in a version of which we have received the first volume, published by Bosworth. A notice of the work, which has appeared in a newspaper, speaks of the translator's notes as indicating 'Irvingism:' but Dr. Thiersch himself belongs to the same body. His History—and it is an extremely able and interesting composition—comes before us under circumstances of the greatest interest. He grapples with the difficulty which has always been urged against these views. If the Church has for seventeen centuries been suffering under the abeyance of the Apostolate, how came it, we have asked, that the Apostles made no provision for the continuance of their special and paramount office?—how came it that the Episcopate, without protest or complaint, superseded it? Did the Apostles neglect their duty—we desire to speak reverently—or did the Church conspire to prevent the transmission of their special authority

and gifts? These are questions which have been hitherto answered or evaded in a very declamatory fashion. Dr. Thiersch, however, as an historian, could not escape the difficulty: the transition from the Apostolic to the post-Apostolic age must compel him to speak out. We turned, therefore, with the greatest anxiety to the conclusion of the first volume, where this period is discussed. We looked for documents and authorities to prove the fact; and we examined Dr. Thiersch's disquisition under the influence of the dilemma which has always presented itself to our minds as fatal to the Irvingite claims—Either the Church submitted to the greatest possible loss and fall in spiritual and hierarchical powers, by permitting the Apostolic Office to glide away without an effort to retain it, and this without a protest or murmur against this treason in the matter of a Divine ordinance; or, it was not part of the Christian economy to preserve the Apostolic Office in such distinctness as the Irvingites claim for it. Dr. Thiersch's point, therefore, must be to show that the transitional Church did know its loss, and did reclaim against it, and did something to retain the Apostolate. It is only fair to this writer—especially as he is the first to acknowledge the pinch of the argument—to let him plead his own cause. And the importance of the subject will excuse the length of our citation, which we present without comment, simply remarking that this is what we have so long looked for, the historical evidence which the 'Irvingites' have to produce for their claims.

'The time came when the rule of the Apostles was either to cease or to 'pass into other hands. Each individual Church, which had received a 'bishop from the Apostles, was protected and provided for, as long as he 'lived. But who was to undertake the oversight of all Churches, and of 'those set over them? From whom, in the event of uncertainty or discord 'among Bishops, could instruction in the truth, and decision as to right 'and wrong, go forth, in a way which should both bind and satisfy all? Who 'had authority to ordain elders and bishops, as the Apostles had hitherto 'done, and to found new bishoprics? Who had confidence to impart, with 'the same power and efficacy, that establishing grace and seal of confirmation, which the first believers had received from the Apostles themselves?

'The primitive Church knew nothing of the confused and confounding 'modern doctrine, that all ecclesiastical power rests in the multitude, and 'that a majority can elect, commission, and empower to all spiritual functions. There is, in all antiquity, no trace of the idea, that, when the 'Apostles died out, their authority devolved upon the whole body of the 'faithful, to be by them committed afresh to individuals. And men were 'then too cautious and scrupulous in holy things, to interpret any inward 'impulse to labour for the good of the Church, however powerful and 'genuine, into a divine commission, legitimate call, and adequate endowment, for such momentous functions.

'The majority of apostolic functions had been performed by apostolic 'delegates, as well as by Apostles. Else the Church could not have been 'planted in so short a time throughout the whole Roman empire. The 'commission of these delegates, however, was not only personal to them, 'but not even for life, being limited to certain occasions and services. 'Hence we nowhere find that, on the death of John, any survivors, who

Digitized by Google

'had been used as delegates, undertook the care of the Church universal. 'The most of them, as Mark, Luke, and Timothy, were indeed, by later 'writers, called Apostles. But this was evidently in that vague use of 'the name which is common to this day. It is, indeed, not impossible that 'one or other of these men may, like Paul or Barnabas, have been actually 'called to and qualified for apostolic labours. Yet there is no proof what-'ever of this. Tradition informs us, on the contrary, that the most of 'these delegates afterwards laboured as bishops. Their calling, to serve 'the Church as a whole, fell into abeyance; and they became exclusively 'chief shepherds of particular Churches. For this is the difference between 'a bishop and a delegate; that the former is permanently set over and 'wedded to a particular Church, as Christ to the whole. That ancient 'canon which provides, that no bishop shall be taken from one Church to 'be set over another, save on the most special and urgent grounds, was, 'doubtless, founded on apostolic recollections.

'Thus we see also the difference between apostles and bishops. The 'former are bound to no one diocese; the latter are. Each bishop has 'authority in Christ's stead over his own Church, to teach, exhort, bless, 'exercise discipline, and send out the Gospel; but not to judge other 'bishops, or labour in a foreign diocese. It is well known how clearly the 'principle, that no bishop was responsible to another, was expressed by 'Cyprian, as late as 256, in the Council of Carthage. And that certainly 'implied that none could be regarded as set over the whole Church.

'If it were true, that the Apostles had appointed bishops, in conse-'quence of feeling that they were about to depart, or in other words, had 'made the institution of the episcopate part of their testament to the 'Church, so that, by their dying directions, their power should be in-'herited by bishops, the usual episcopal theory would be well founded. 'But the fact is not so. This episcopal office was, in its essence and origin, 'no continuance of, or substitute for, the apostolic. The absence of 'Apostles was not the condition of its origin or agency. It did not come 'into life as apostleship died. On the contrary, it existed simultaneously 'with apostleship. It was instituted to co-exist with apostleship. And 'the condition of its right operation and development was that it should 'be upheld by apostleship. While John was yet in the plenitude of his 'authority and labours, he had seven bishops, at least, under him in Asia. 'Episcopacy, therefore, is not only quite a different thing from what mere 'Episcopalians would make it, but is, in this respect, a much higher thing, 'that it is properly no accidental substitute or surrogate for any higher 'office, but an essential and distinct member in the original organization of 'the Church according to the will of God, with functions as definite as, yet 'wholly different from, those of Apostles. Apostles, bishops are not. 'Although they have been in fact successors of Apostles, they were not 'appointed to be so. . . . . .

'Equally erroneous is the opinion that episcopal government was intro-'duced by the surviving Apostles, after the fall of Jerusalem, to provide a 'basis of unity for the Church, and bind the many congregations into one 'corporation. The very Apostles who are supposed to have done so, were the basis of unity themselves. The Church, as an organic whole, is as old

Digitized by Google

'as the apostleship itself. Bishops of equal rank, whose number under 'Trajan probably amounted to hundreds, were by no means the fit instru- 'ment for making or maintaining the unity of the Church-Catholic; partly 'because at that time an episcopal council was all but impossible; yet 'chiefly because, after it became possible, the bishops themselves were, 'each of them, one with his own flock; and the question, how the flocks 'were to be kept in unity, really resolved itself into the question, how 'the bishops were to be kept in the same. The Apostles could maintain 'unity, because they formed a central power, and each belonged to the 'whole Church, and none were identified with any one flock. When they 'disappeared, the Church demanded some higher substitute for their uni- 'versal central authority, than an aggregate of those very local elements 'which needed to be kept together.

'But there was no such substitute to be had at the time. Therefore, by 'necessary consequence, those apostolic functions which were necessary for 'the existence of every flock, such as confirmation of the baptized and 'ordination of elders, devolved on the bishop of each Church. They could 'not be given up, and they could not proceed from any but the highest 'existing ordinance, *i. e.* the episcopal. Now this took place universally, 'and without contradiction, save in the single case of Egypt. To explain 'so remarkable a fact, we must have recourse to the supposition, that, 'already during the life of the Apostles, and not without their approba- 'tion, the chief shepherds had been accustomed in many churches to con- 'firm and ordain, under reservation of the subsequent apostolic sanction. 'We cannot imagine that John, in those years in which he alone repre- 'sented the apostleship, was personally at work in all provinces of Chris- 'tendom. The bishops could not suddenly have undertaken, say in the 'year 100, that which had been invariably done by Apostles before. An 'enlargement of the episcopal functions must have accompanied the 'gradually increasing rarity of the apostolic. . . . . .

'The remnants of antiquity have very little to say as to what provision 'the Apostles made for future generations in this matter. Paul indeed 'commanded Timothy (2 Tim. ii. 2;) "What thou hast heard of me, before 'many witnesses, commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach 'others also." These words no doubt establish a succession; and a por- 'tion of apostolic authority must have passed from Paul through Timothy 'to these faithful men, and to their successors throughout. He must be 'destitute of all esteem for history and authority, who is not impressed by 'the proof of an uninterrupted apostolic succession. But all this says 'nothing as to the extent of the power which so descended through 'Timothy. And it is impossible, from this text alone, to justify, as normal 'and right, all the ecclesiastical order which the second century presents 'to us. . . . . .

'On the extinction of the apostolic office, without an adequate surrogate, 'Christendom was certainly neither so blind nor so indifferent, as not to 'feel its loss. And the New Testament itself affords to us the most accre- 'dited testimony as to the feelings of the faithful at that time. This is the 'addition made to the Gospel of John by his disciples after his death. '(John xxi.)

Digitized by Google

'Christ had already said, before His transfiguration on the Mount, '"There be some of them which stand here, who shall not taste of death, 'till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom." (Matt. xvi. 28.) 'After His resurrection, when He appeared to the seven disciples on the 'sea of Tiberias, He spoke a word full of mystery to John, which came to 'the ears of the faithful, and especially occupied those among whom John 'spent his last days. "The saying went abroad among the disciples, that 'this disciple should not die." (John xxi. 23.) Many expected, therefore, 'to see fulfilled in him the above prophecy given by our Lord. And, on 'the decease of all the other apostles, the expectation became more lively, 'that John, who had been so wonderfully preserved, should witness the 'return of the Lord. But it happened otherwise. He also went to his 'rest after attaining the utmost limit of man's age. He did not die as 'a martyr—for, as the saying went, he did not need that purgation. He 'died in Ephesus. His tomb stood outside the city. We may imagine 'the deep impression made by his death upon the faithful. The fact was 'then unquestionable. Was, then, the word of Christ to go unfulfilled? 'The last chapter of John's Gospel meets this question. It is, in our 'opinion, chiefly written by John himself. The last verses only are added 'by the elders of Ephesus, who had the keeping of the sacred book. Christ 'had foretold to Peter his martyrdom. Then asked Peter, concerning John, '"But what shall this man do?" Jesus answered, "If I will that he 'tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." Then comes 'the notice by the elders, "Jesus said not," This disciple "shall not die; 'but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" The elders, 'therefore, give no interpretation of this remarkable saying. They merely 'remind us of what Christ had not said. He had spoken only condi- 'tionally; If I will. Still His language was that of one who did entertain 'such a thought, and yet had reason to withhold a positive assertion. It 'was no meaningless abstract assertion of a possibility which no one would 'question. Nor was it solely a rebuke to Peter. It evidently expressed 'a special purpose in regard to John, although its literal understanding 'by the disciples was erroneous. As to this the elders are silent. Their 'addition to the Gospel was intended merely to obviate the troubles 'created by the death of the Apostle, not to give a full solution to the words 'of Christ, which the Church should lay up in her heart.

'And it is no wonder that the above idea as to the destiny of John kept 'its ground in the Church. It reappears in the form of two traditions, 'that John had not really died, and that he had died and was risen again. 'The former is reported by Augustine in his 224th Homily of the Gospel on 'John, not as giving credence to it, but the reverse. Some, he says, assert, 'that John descended into the grave, which he had caused to be made for 'himself, seemed dead, and was shut in—but that he had only fallen asleep, 'to awake at the day of judgment, and that the earth of his grave is 'lifted by the action of his breathing. On the other hand, the Greek 'tradition is, that God, immediately after John's death, raised him again, 'and keeps him, that he may come in the last times to testify for the 'truth, and along with Elias and Enoch, to overcome Antichrist. (Ephraim 'of Theopolis ap. Photion in Myriobibl. cod. 229, p. 797 c., p. 800 b. c.

Digitized by Google

'Ed. 1653.) This idea, which stands in evident connexion with a literal 'understanding of two well known texts in the Apocalypse (Rev. x. 11; 'xi. 3), became very prevalent among the later Greeks. Nay, it is ex- 'pressed in their ritual. And some Latin doctors, both of the middle ages 'and of later times, have inclined to it.

'Why do we cite these fancies of a period subsequent to that of which 'we treat? Because they were the last relics of an opinion as old as the 'apostolic age. And whence sprang this primitive tradition with all its 'offsets? From the persuasion of the Church, at the death of John, that 'the apostolic office should be preserved to the Church, in the last at 'least of those who possessed it; that the Church still needed it; that it 'could not be awanting at the end of the days; that it had yet the works 'to do, of conquering Antichrist, and of completing the yet imperfect pre- 'paration of the faithful for the coming again of Christ.

'A longing for the preservation of the peculiar blessing of apostleship 'is thus shown to have been felt by the primitive Church, and must have 'been increased by the conviction that the internal progress of the Church 'to perfection did not keep pace with its outward extension. Widely as the 'Church extended under Trajan, it betrayed a marked decay of its original 'light and power, to which all that still remains from that time, the writ- 'ings of all the so-called apostolic fathers, bears sorrowful witness. So 'great is the difference between their best productions and the apostolic 'writings, that a glance at the respective worth and contents of the two 'classes of documents is sufficient to remove all uncertainty as to the 'boundary between canonical and uncanonical Christian literature. The 'subsequent experience of the Church confirms the verdict of antiquity in 'this matter.

'It is said that John, enfeebled by great age, being carried into the 'meeting of the Church, merely repeated the words, "My beloved chil- 'dren, love one another." (Hieron. Comm. ad Galat. c. vi. p. 100, d.) This 'exhortation the Church laid to heart and followed, as we may judge from 'the unity in which it lived during the succeeding generation, being kept 'together, no longer indeed by the Apostles, but by the love which they 'had shed abroad in it, and by the careful observance of what it had 'received from them. The heads of the flocks felt themselves like orphans 'on the death of Philip, Andrew, and John. But those orphans only kept 'the closer together. Faithfulness to their trust, reverence for tradition, 'was their motto. But, with all this, no more could be preserved than 'what the Church, as a whole, had really laid hold of and appropriated as 'a part of her life. She could never thus ripen into perfect maturity for 'the kingdom to come. That which she lacked, from that time forward, 'was the progress of that spiritual growth, which Peter, Paul, and John 'had both exhibited and commenced.

'Whether such a progress should again be seen, was a question on which 'the Church had as little light as on the duration of time which should 'elapse before she should reach the goal of her race. We could not expect 'to find any definite views among the teachers of that time as to a future 'revival of a proper apostolic action, unless it had been plain to them that 'centuries should elapse before the second coming of the Lord, and that

Digitized by Google

the work than fresh wrought by Apostles should thus utterly decay. The 'work of progressive building did stand still, even as Hermas saw it in 'vision, that many might in the interval have space for repentance. But 'no one could guess the duration of the interval. It was not known, that 'whole nations should stream into the Church, and that a Christian family 'of peoples should take the lead of the human race. The depth of the fall 'of Christendom was very much hidden from the eyes of the first fathers, 'and therefore it is not wonderful, that the ultimate deliverance from 'declension and ruin, and a return to an apostolic condition, was the 'object rather of their desire and indefinite presentiment, than of their 'intelligent expectation and endeavours.'—Pp. 335—351.

We have in our extracts omitted Mr. Carlyle's notes, which are weak in themselves, and, in connexion with his author, quite out of place. Dr. Thiersch will scarcely thank his annotator, Mr. Carlyle, for reminding us of what was sufficiently plain, that the cardinal argument for the especial claims of his co-religionists is to be detected in the romantic tradition of the Wandering Jew, which he assures us embodies that peculiar clinging to S. John and to his solitary position as the last of the apostolic college, upon which historical 'Irvingism' builds so largely.

Mr. William Fraser's 'Constitutional Nature of the Convocations of the Church of England,' (J. H. Parker,) is a pamphlet unusually replete with research and information. We have received it at the last moment, otherwise we should have willingly transferred the results of much of its learning and soundness to our own article on the subject.

A very good paper read by Mr. Arthur Baker at the Bucks Architectural Society's anniversary has reached us. It treats of Seats in Churches, and the writer has adopted, and well expresses, sound views of his subject.

Among single Sermons—we have already taken detailed notice of several—we may point out for especial commendation one preached by Mr. J. Powell Marriott at Leicester, at the Annual Meeting of the Religious Societies: its title is, 'The Common Prayer of the Church, a means of advancing Christ's Kingdom.' (J. H. Parker.)

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOL. XXIV.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Achilli and Newman [*Finlason's Report, &c.*], 401—424. Delicacy of the subject, 401. Its moral importance, 402. Its effects in connexion with the Roman system, 403. Life of Achilli, 404—411. How far did the Church connive at Achilli's life, 413. General aspect of the question, 414—424.

C.

Church Festivals and their Household Words [*Monthly Packet, &c.*], 385—400. Household Influence of the Middle Age Church, 385. Its terms and titles national and domestic, 386. Instances, 386—400.

Convocation, Recent Election of Proctors to [*Pearce's Law of Convocation, &c.*], 342—384. The analogy of nature in favour of revivals, 342. Convocation no novelty, 343. Election of Proctors in 1852, 344. Its forms, 345. Revived attention to them, 346, 347. Mr. Pearce's book, 348. Summoning Convocation, 349—351. The Licensed Curates question, 352, 353. Division of dioceses, 354. Election by archdeaconries, 355—357. Mode of election, &c., 358, 359. Right of debate, 360, 361. Contested elections, 362. Preponderance of elections in favour of Synodical Action, 363—368. Chichester election, 369. Winchester election, 370—374. Importance of the elections, 375—384.

J.

Japan [*Mac Farlane's Japan, &c.*], 447—472. European ignorance about Japan, 447. Exclusiveness of Japan, *ibid.* American expedition, 448. Jesuit Missions, 449. History of European intercourse, 450—456. Its geographical character, 457. Its government, 458, 459. Its religion, 460—465. Its possible evangelization, 466—469. Social state of Japan, 470—472.

M.

Mary Queen of Scots [*Mignet's History, &c.*], 20—80. Chivalrous dispute on Mary's character, 20. Her fascinations, 21. Mignet's facts at issue with his conclusions, 22. Mary's education, 23. General profligacy of the French Court, 24. Mary's life, 25. Her character, history, and general reflections 26—80.

P.

Pascal and Ultramontanism [*Maynard's Edition, and Refutation, of Les Provinciales*], 176—243. M. Maynard's method, 176. Its dangers, 177, and style, 178. Mode of answering Pascal twofold, 179. Alleged unfairness of Pascal, 180. His quotations, 181—186. Easy casuistry, 186—190. The doctrine of Probabilism, 191—194. Bauny and Escobar, 195—198. P. Barry, 199, 200. Practice, 201. Penitence, 202—204. Confession made popular, 205. Contrition, 206. Genuine view of the Jesuit morality, 207—243.

Pfeiffer, Madame [*Voyage to Iceland, &c.*], 255—282. Qualities necessary to a traveller, 255—258. Madame P.'s characteristics, 259. What she has achieved, 260. Her self-possession, 261, 262. Indifference to religion, 263. Her voyage to Iceland, 269—281. Her plans for future travel, 282.

Digitized by Google

Poetry, Recent [*Works of Moir and Reade, &c.*], 283—341. Various forms of the poetical character, 283, 286. Mr. Moir and Mr. Reade, 287. Mr. Moir's life, 287—291. Criticism of their collected works, 291—341.

S.

Seats, open, in Churches [*Oliphant's Law of Pews, &c.*], 81—136. Freedom of worship, 81. Opposed by pews, 82. Trouble of Church structures, 83. Common Prayer and Sacraments, 84. Normal idea of a Church, 84, 85. Churchwardens, 86. Law and history of sittings in churches, 87. Pew, open seats, &c. &c. 87—136.

Sellon, Miss [*Tracts by Mr. Spurrell, Miss Sellon, Bishop of Exeter, &c.*], 151—175. The subject distasteful, 152. Who are open to criticism, 153 Superiors and inferiors, 154—158. Miss S.'s Rule of Obedience, 159. The principles which it involves—its dangers, &c., 160—175.

Shaftesbury, Lord, the Chevalier Bunsen, and the Bible Society [*The Record Newspaper, &c.*], 137—150. Lord Shaftesbury and the Bible Society's Anniversary, 137. The Tractarian School, 138. Their alleged tenderness to infidelity, 138, 139. Chevalier Bunsen a sceptic, 140. His treatment of scriptural statements, 141. His estimate of Ewald, 142—144. Lord Shaftesbury's dishonesty, 144—146. Dr. Pusey's Letter to Lord Shaftesbury, in the *Morning Chronicle*, 147—150.

Stonehenge [*Mr. Herbert's 'Cyclops Christianus,' &c.*], 1—19. Historical criticism, 1. Mr. Herbert, 2, 3. The Druids, and alleged antiquity of Stonehenge, 4. Mr. Herbert's objections to the received accounts—he contends that they are post-Roman works, 4—19.

W.

Words, Study of [*Trench on Study of Words*], 425—446. Accuracy of language, 425. Selection of words, 426. Its educational and moral purposes, 427, 428. General reflections on the value and importance of the study of words, 430—446.

Digitized by Google

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JULY.—Wilson's Sacra Privata—English Alice — Gilbert Arnold — The Divine Master — Rymer Jones's Natural History of Animals—Instrumenta Ecclesiastica (Second Series)—Conquerors of the New World — Smith's Inquiry into Catholic Matters — Dowell's Catechism on Church Services — Jubilee Year of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel—Hoare's Ecclesiastical History—Pott's Lectures — Oremus — Trevilian on Rev. xiii. 18—Caswall, &c. on Synodical Action—Scott's Reply to Goode—Flower's ditto—Jebb's Plea for Cathedrals—How to reclaim lost population?—Griffiths' Translations from the Sanskrit—Emphatic New Testament—Hirscher on a New Reformation — Coxe's Sympathies of the Continent — Eclipse of Faith — Restoration of Belief—Evenings at Sackville College—Neale's Lectures on Church Difficulties—Johns's History of Spain—Our New Parish—Our Doctor—Davies and Vaughan's Translation of Plato's Republic—Archdeacon Wilberforce's Charge —Sermons by T. J. Smith, C. C. Spencer, Codd, Steel, Skinner, &c.

OCTOBER.—Masters's New Biographical Series — Gresley's Sermon on Church Music — Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell—Harington's Succession of Bishops — The Christian Student - Sermons by Harness and Hale—Life Assurance—Rounds and Catches —The Song School, &c.—Strife for the Mastery—Sunlight in the Clouds—Bishop Forbes on the Nicene Creed—Stories and Catechising, illustrative of the Collects—Williams's Biography of Mr. Suckling—Uncle Tom's Cabin—Walks after Wild Flowers—Evans's Sermons — Cyclopædia Bibliographica — Stark's History of the Bishopric of Lincoln — Laurence's Essay on Confession, &c.—Romanism, an Apostate Church—Burton's Falconry—Burney Prize Essay—Bishop of Oxford on S. P. G. Jubilee—Sisters of Mercy —The Coming Man—Benson's Sermon on Christian Education — Browne's Letter to Mr. Walpole—Renovation of Cathedral Institutions—Barter's Socialism and Infidelity —Cole's Reflective Letter—Six Sermons on Christian Union—Stretton's Guide—School Inspectors' Report — Quakerism — Mozley's Kings of England—Hymnal—Landmarks of Ancient History — Norrisian Essay — Anticleptic Gradus—Butler's Sermons—Spark's Lecture—Thiersch's History of the Christian Church — Fraser on Convocations — Bucks Architectural Society—Sermon by Rev. J. P. Marriott.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google